STATE LIBRARY OF PENNSYLVANIA
205Ev13
main,stks
Lutheran quarterly.
v.27 1897 Lutheran quarterly
0 0001 00658529 1

REFERENCE

COLLECTIONS

04-79-815-3

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

https://archive.org/details/vol27lutheranqua00luth

THE

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

EDITED BY

PHILIP M. BIKLÉ,

WITH THE SPECIAL CO-OPERATION OF

M. VALENTINE, D. D., LL. D.,
E. J. WOLF, D. D.,
S. A. ORT, D. D., LL. D.,
W. H. WYNN, PH. D., D. D.

NEW SERIES—VOL. XXVII.

GETTYSBURG:
J. E. WIBLE, PRINTER, CARLISLE STREET (SECOND SQUARE).
1897.

PRINCETON
THEOLOGICAL

INDEX TO VOL. XXVII.

Archæology, Oriental, and the Old Testament, 559.
Augsburg Confession, Melanchthon and the, 299.
Augsburg Confession, Tenth Article of the, 457.
Baugher Lecture, 377.
Bauslin, Dr. D. H., Art. by, 341.
Behringer, Dr. G. F., Art. by, 254.
Breckenridge, Dr. S. F., Art. by, 520.
Brown, Dr. J. A., Arts. by, 132, 544.
Burial, Christian, 331.
Christ, The, of All Days, 117.
Christian Burial, 331.
Christian Endeavor Movement, 276.
Christian Worship, The Word of God in, 377.
Christ's Glorified Humanity and the Lord's Supper, 62.
Classical Languages in Education, 33.
Cleavage, The Line of, 50.
Communion of Saints, 1.
Conscience, The Objective, 71.
Day, The, of Pentecost, 406.
Deitz, Rev. A. E., Art. by, 210.
Delk, Rev. E. H., Arts. by, 117, 276.
Divine Healing, or Faith Cure, 263.
Doctrine, The, of the Ministry, 200.
Doctrines, The Fundamental, 501.
Early History of the Lutheran Church in Georgia, 155.
Education, The Classical Languages in, 33.
Evolution as Taught in Scripture, 210.
Eyster, Dr. W. F., Art. by, 441.
Faith Cure, 263.
Fox, Dr. J. B., Art. by, 559.
Fox, Dr. L. A., Art. by, 1.
Fundamental Doctrines, The, 501.
Georgia, Early Lutheran Church in, 155.
Gilbert, Dr. D. M., Art. by, 155.
Glorified Humanity of Christ, 62.
Hall, Dr. H. H., Art. by, 531.
Hawkins, Rev. Elijah, Sketch of, 132.
Heresy, The Unconscious Spirit of, 548.
Himes, Rev. T. A., Art. by, 233.
Holman Lecture, 457.
Horn, Dr. E. T., Arts. by, 84, 377.
Huber, Dr. Eli, Art. by, 406.
Hull, Rev. W. E., Art. by, 263.
Immortality in the Light of Scripture and Nature, 441.
Inspiration of the Scriptures, 217.
Jacoby, Dr. J. C., Art. by, 217.
John Wesley and the Salzburgers, 370.
Justification and Regeneration, Relative Positions of, 175.
Kelly, Rev. William, Art. by, 12.
Keyser, Rev. L. S., Arts. by, 62, 501.
Knubel, Rev. F. H., Art. by, 175.
Line of Cleavage, The, 50.
Lord's Supper, The, 457.
Lord's Supper, Lutheran Doctrine of the, 233.

13514

Lord's Supper, The, and Christ's Glorified Humanity, 62.
Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper, 233.
Luther's Attitude at the Marburg Colloquy, 488.
Manhart, Rev. F. P., Art. by, 457.
Marburg Colloquy, The, 488.
Mars, The Planet, 520.
Melanchthon, Philip, 12.
Melanchthon as Theologian, 254.
Melanchthon and the Augsburg Confession, 299.
Ministry, The Doctrine of the, 200.
Moses as a Scholar, 531.
Objective Conscience, The, 71.
Oriental Archæology and the Old Testament, 559.
Pentecost, The Day of, 406.
Philip Melanchthon, 12.
Pillar, The, of the Truth, 84.
Planet Mars, The, 520.
Preaching, The, for a Theological Crisis, 341.
Relative Positions of Regeneration and Justification in Lutheran Dogmatic Theology, 175.
Review of Recent Literature, 137, 284, 525, 575.
Richard, Dr. J. W., Art. by, 299.
Richards, Dr. M. H., Art. by, 71.
Saints, Communion of, 1.
Salzburgers, John Wesley and the, 370.
Scherer, Gideon, 544.
Scholar, Moses as a, 531.
Scriptural Evolution, 210.
Scriptures, The Inspiration of, 217.
Seebach, Rev. J. F., Art. by, 548.
Sketch of Gideon Scherer, 544.
Sketch of Rev. Elijah Hawkins, 132.
Stough, Dr. J. H., Art. by, 33.
Strength and Weakness of the Christian Endeavor Movement, 276.
Theologian, Melanchthon as, 254.
Theological Crisis, The Preaching for a, 341.
Truth, The Pillar of the, 84.
Unconscious Spirit, The, of Heresy, 548.
Voigt, Dr. A. G., Art. by, 370.
Wenner, Dr. G. U., Arts. by, 50, 200, 331.
Word of God, The, in Christian Worship, 377.
Young, Dr. J. J., Art. by, 488.

THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF

THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

JANUARY, 1897.

ARTICLE I.

COMMUNION OF SAINTS.

By Professor Luther A. Fox, D. D.

The communion of saints is an article in the Apostles' Creed. It is not proposed to discuss its meaning in the Creed, but the acquaintance of the dead with the current events of the world.

As memory and affection survive death, the dead do not lose their interest in the world. The lost, as is shown in the case of the rich man, do not cease to love their families and friends who are yet on earth. Much less do the saints who are in the realm of love, and whose natures are expanded to higher and truer love, cease to love the surviving families and friends. They form new and very congenial associations. Their love for God is greatly increased. They are deeply interested in the wonderful facts of their new home. But if the damned, whose affections are dwarfed, and whose natures are soured, are not so absorbed by their agonies, neither will the saved be so occupied with their happiness as to forget the ties of earth.

The Christian on earth loves God supremely, but he loves also his family. Supreme love for God enlarges our hearts and intensifies our natural affections. We have evidence of our love

to God in the fact that we love more our fellowmen. "We know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren." Separation and new association here on earth gradually weaken our affections, until at length we feel only a slight interest in those whom we once tenderly loved, but under the new conditions of the spirit world this limitation may be removed, and years may make no change.

The saints retain a profound interest in the world. The interest felt here is deepened there by their new relations. They love Christ more. They understand better the mission of the Church. They realize more fully the close connection between the state of the Church and the glory of its Head. They become, therefore, more profoundly concerned in its progress. Their own advancement may be conditioned upon its success. This deeper interest in the Church increases their interest in their friends. The saints may care much less about the health and temporal success, but much more about the growth in grace, and the activity in religious work of their loved ones yet in the flesh.

This interest will make the saints anxious to know what is taking place in the world. If there is any legitimate means of obtaining information, they will avail themselves of it. If they know nothing of us and of the Church since they left us, it is solely because they cannot.

There are several possible and probable means by which they may keep up an acquaintance with the world.

They may learn much from those who are entering heaven. The dying carry with them into the other world all the information in their possession of the state of their friends and of the world. There is no conceivable reason why they should not communicate this information to those who preceded them. It seems perfectly natural that they should desire to tell all they know to those willing to hear. The saints are eager to learn. The only room for doubt is in regard to the meeting of these friends. It may seem improbable that, amid the immense throng, those just dead should meet those who had preceded them from the same community. But this improbability is largely removed by facts which shall hereafter appear. As we send messages to

distant friends by those passing from us to them, there is nothing improper in sending messages by the dying to our friends in heaven. They will certainly inquire about us, and we may give them assurances of our continued hope and faith and love for them.

The saints may learn of the world and of their friends from the angels. The angels are ministering spirits to the heirs of salvation. They rejoice over every sinner that repenteth. They are intimately acquainted with the minute affairs of the Church. They are studying with intense zeal the mysteries of redemption. The heavens are opened and they are continually ascending and descending on their missions of love. The saints doubtless inquire of them concerning their friends who are still in the world.

The saints are probably immediate personal observers. The proof is not positive, but affords a strong degree of probability.

Immediate personal observation is not in itself impossible. They are pure spirits, and while they are not omnipotent, they have a celerity that transcends our comprehension. They may be called ubiquitous. Christ said they are like the angels, or equal to the angels. The angels are not bound by the laws of the material world, and have relations to space different from those of physical bodies. They pass from earth to heaven and from heaven to earth with a rapidity greater than that of light, and one that defies our powers of conception. Daniel said: "I set my face unto the Lord to seek by prayer and supplication, with fasting, sackcloth and ashes. While I was speaking and praying and confessing my sins, yea while I was speaking even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly touched me about the time of the evening oblation." Dr. Timothy Dwight remarks upon this passage that "it is a rapidity exceeding the comprehension of the most active imagination, surpassing beyond any comparison the amazing swiftness of light." The saints may, therefore, like the angels pass frequently from their home in heaven to the world and keep themselves as intimately acquainted with the affairs of the world as the angels themselves. If they do not, it is be-

cause of some confinement or special limitations of which we have no intimation.

Foregleams of this power are given us in extraordinary dreams and in cases of special sight. It was customary for a long time to set aside all such things as superstitious and false, but facts have accumulated to such an extent as to forbid a summary dismissal. James Freeman Clark says: "There are the well attested facts concerning the transfer of the senses: that people under the influence of animal magnetism can read with their foreheads, the pit of their stomachs, or the back of their heads. We have seen a boy when magnetized lift a chair with three heavy men standing on it. Clairvoyance, or seeing at a distance, though not so well proved, is confirmed by a vast number of facts. Preternatural knowledge in such cases as narrated by Dr. Bushnell of Yount in California; or knowledge through dreams, waking presentiments; cases of foresight or prophecy; of insight or knowledge of what is passing in other minds; of clairvoyance, or what is happening at a distance, of which multitudes of facts are recorded in such books as the Seeress of Provost, Mrs. Crowe's Night Side of Nature, Robert Dale Owen's Footfalls from the Boundary of the Unseen World, which after being sifted by a fine criticism will have a large residuum of irresolvable facts." (Orthodoxy, p. 78).

We have such cases in various periods and countries. It is said of Ambrose of Milan that while celebrating mass in his own city, he fell into a trance and witnessed the funeral of St. Martin in Tours. Kant tells of the case of Swedenborg who while in Gottenburg described a fire at that moment raging in Stockholm. Dr. Wayland, in an appendix to his Intellectual Philosophy, records the case of a sailor who frequently told of things which were taking place at great distance from himself.

Rev. J. P. Smeltzer, D. D., President of Newberry College, S. C., related this fact. One afternoon he lay down to take a short sleep. He saw a young woman in great suffering, and persons trying to secure relief for her. He felt that he was in a strange state, neither awake nor yet asleep. He was aroused and stated his experience to the minister whom he was assisting in special

services. A few hours later he was summoned home to find that the suffering woman was his own wife, and that the scene he had witnessed had occurred in his own family. He made this statement to the present writer.

A young woman, near Timberville, Va., the subject of cataleptic states, had some quite remarkable experiences. On one occasion she said her soldier brother was sitting on a log writing a letter. The letter came verifying the statement. On another occasion, when recovering from one of these states, she said that a great battle had just been fought and that her brother had been killed. Her statements were in a few days confirmed. These facts were furnished by a minister who was a perfectly competent and reliable witness.

Three members of the Society for Psychical Research in England, Messrs. E. Gurney, M. A., of Cambridge, F. W. H. Myers, M. A., of Cambridge, and F. Podmore, M. A., have given us Phantasms of the Living in two large octavo volumes, the materials for which had been reported to the society and ordered published. In these volumes we have a great many cases collated with scientific care. The main theses of the book are stated thus: "I. Experiment proves that telepathy—the supersensory transference of thought and feeling from one mind to another—is a fact in Nature. II. Testimony proves that phantasms, (impressions, voices or figures) of persons undergoing some crisis—especially death—are perceived by their friends and relatives with a frequency which mere chance cannot explain. III. These phantasms then, whatever else they may be, are instances of the supersensory action of one mind on another. Such are the theses of this work,—theses on which its authors and the friends whom they have mainly consulted are in entire agreement."

These gentlemen have not thoroughly succeeded in establishing beyond question their theses, but they have done much toward showing their high probability. They have given some philosophic support to the opinion entertained by such eminent men as Bacon and Gœthe, and commenced the answer to the question asked by Tennyson,—

"Star to star vibrates light, may soul to soul
Strike thro' some finer element of her own?"

The conclusion we would draw is only hypothetical. If it be true that minds encumbered with bodies, and habituated to the use of the senses can in extraordinary cases know objects and events in a manner above the reach of the senses, then can pure spirits observe at much greater distances. The facts make it probable that the saints can know what is occurring upon the earth. But it must be admitted that scientific observation has not and cannot furnish any direct evidence of the fact that the dead are observers of the events upon earth.

The Scriptures encourage, at least, the belief that the saints are acquainted with the affairs of the Church in this world.

In the account of the transfiguration we have the fact that on extraordinary occasions the saints know what is taking place among men, and that they may revisit the earth. Elijah and Moses came and ministered to Jesus. They talked with him about his death which was then pending. In this case they show an intimate acquaintance with the affairs of the world. It may have been by special inspiration, or it may have been that a special privilege was granted to these two for the mission. But the stronger probability is that they enjoyed only a common benefit. We have this truth beyond question, that under some circumstances the saints may be witnesses of things on the earth.

In the Old Testament we have the account of the appearance of Samuel at the call of the witch of Endor. Samuel told Saul of his death the next day on Gilboa. Samuel knew what had occurred, where the armies were encamped, and what would be the result of the impending battle. True, he had been a prophet and may have retained his prophetic powers after his death, but we have left the fact that some of the saints know the actions and conditions of men. This story and its lessons have been questioned by some modern critics. We have not sufficient evidence of its spuriousness to cause us to reject it. So far as appears, it was a part of the original record, and comes to us with the authority of inspiration. We must accept it, or read out of these ancient

books everything that is extraordinary. If we reject one statement, because it does not accord with our ideas of the probable, where shall we stop short of a rejection of the very idea of revelation.

In the Book of Revelation there is mention of two occasions (chap. 19 : 9, 10, and 22 : 8, 9,) where John saw an angel and fell down to worship him. Both angels forbade it, the one saying: "See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow servant and of them that have the testimony of Jesus;" the other: "See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow servant, and one of thy brethren the prophets." One of the old prophets was sent back under the garb of an angel to reveal to John, his fellow servant, the things to come. The ordinary interpretation finds, however, simply an angel. If he had wished to characterize himself only as an angel, it was not necessary for him to add "of thy brethren the prophets." Is it true that a mere angel is one of the prophets?

In the Epistle to the Hebrews we have this language: "Wherefore seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us run with patience the race set before us." This follows the eleventh chapter in which a number of examples of faith are enumerated and which closes with the words: "And what shall I more say? for the time would fail me to tell of Gideon and of Barak, and of Samson, and of Jephtha, of David also, and of the prophets; who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of aliens, women received their dead raised to life again, and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection; and others had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover, of bonds and imprisonments; they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword; they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented, (of whom the world was not worth); they wandered in deserts, in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth. And these all having obtained a good re-

port through faith received not the promise, God having provided some better things for us, that they without us should not be made perfect. Wherefore, seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses," &c. There has not been nor can be a question as to the fact that the cloud of witnesses is in some way connected with the sainted dead, but there is a difference of opinion as to the manner of witnessing. Perhaps a majority of the Protestants who have ventured on an opinion, have regarded the language as highly figurative. They hold that the writer of the Epistle personifies the examples and sets them up as witnesses. This interpretation robs the exhortation of its chief force. A mere abstraction is very little stimulus to endeavor. The supposed fervid imagination of that writer cannot be sustained by other Christians under the severe physical trials of stonings and imprisonments. It is not a sudden spurt of effort, but a life-long race to which he is pointing. The examples of others are not usually thought of as witnesses, though they may give encouragement. This interpretation so weakens the words of the apostle and is so unsatisfactory that many others who are unwilling to accept the literal meaning, have avoided any explanation whatever. The literal interpretation of the Scriptures, when no special nor cogent reason for the figurative exists, is always to be preferred.

The writer in grouping the suffering saints of other ages has been moved, but has not been so impassioned as to jump from facts to the bold imagery the ordinary interpretation requires. For these reasons some Protestants have adhered to the natural meaning. Fausset says: "The witnesses answer to the spectators pressing around the arena to see the competitors for the prize. Those witnessed of become intense witnesses in a twofold way: (1) Attesting by their own case the faithfulness of God to his people; (2) witnessing our struggle of faith. This second sense, though agreeing with the image, is not positively and directly sustained by Scripture." The commentator sees the truth but he does not venture to break away absolutely from the old interpretations. Dr. A. P. Peabody does not hesitate to speak out his whole opinion. "This idea of the presence of the

departed and their surviving interest in the scenes among which their trophies were won, is a familiar one with the sacred writers, though nowhere else exhibited with the scenic effect with which it is here placed before the imagination. What a glorious and inspiring thought that we are acting our parts, fulfilling our mission beneath the loving and solicitous regards of the great and good as their ranks have multiplied all down through the Christian ages.*

Whether from the Bible or apostolic tradition, or from some other source, the belief that the saints are frequently with us made its appearance at a very early period in the Church. Origen held that "the souls of good men after the death of the body are turned into angels and fly about the world, helping and defending men from mishaps."† It had become universal long before the alienation between the Greek and Roman Churches. Upon it was based the custom, which was universal all down through the Middle Ages, of the invocation of the saints. Those who opposed that service, as Lactantius and Athanasius, based their objection not on the fact that the saints could not be present, but upon the principle that God is the sole object of prayer. The Greek and Roman Churches still hold to the invocation of the saints, and thus believe without question that the saints are intimately acquainted with us.

Many eminent Protestants, while rejecting the invocation of the saints, agree with the Roman and Greek Churches in the belief that the dead are in close fellowship and intimate association with men on the earth.

Dr. Nevin defends it upon the ground of its catholicity. "It is moreover a strictly catholic idea, the sense of which has been actively present in the mind of the Church through all ages in her doctrine of the communion of saints. This regards not merely Christians on earth but also the sainted dead according to the true sense of the hymn,

> "The saints on earth and all the dead
> But one communion make."

*Christian Consolation. †Chemnitz's Examen.

But communion implies a continuity of reciprocal knowledge and affection. If death sundered absolutely the new consciousness of the believer from the old, there could be no real conjunction of this sort between the living and the departed members of Christ's body. There is a dangerous tendency in the religious world at the present time towards a false view of this relation, by which in fact the dead are taken to be so dissociated from the living as to have no further part in the onward movement of Christ's kingdom. But this is an error fully as bad, to say the least, as the old superstition of invoking the saints and praying for the dead."*

Dr. Samuel Hopkins maintains it upon the ground of the increased powers and advantages of the saints. "They do not go into some dark corner of the universe, out of sight of heaven, of Christ, of his Church and of the world; but when they leave the body they rise into light and take a station in which they are under advantages to see all those things, and all worlds, being all attention to them, and having a perfect discerning without the least cloud or darkness, seeing and enjoying the glory of the Redeemer, and the prosperity and success of the work of redemption among men. And their happiness must increase as the cause of Christ advances on earth and as the kingdom of Satan sinks and is destroyed."†

Dr. Mulford puts it upon the same ground. "They who have gone have not, therefore, passed into a condition of lethargy and vacancy. They may be nearer to us as they are nearer to perfect love. They may guide us towards a holier and ampler freedom since they suffer no more the limitations of time. The veil is rent. There is with us the presence of the unseen host. It is not alone their memory that remains: their spirits may be with us. This brings us the chastity of hope. It becomes the incentive to effort—seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses let us lay aside every weight."‡

Dr. R. B. Storrs finds a reason in their continued interest in the world. "It is not unnatural to feel that they, who by wis-

*Mystical Presence. †Works. ‡Republic of God.

dom, by valor, by sacrifice have contributed to maintain and perfect the institutions which we possess, have also an interest in this day. To a spirit alive with memories of the time, and rejoicing in the presage of noble futures, recalling the great, the beloved, the heroic who have labored and joyfully died for its coming, it will not seem too fond an enthusiasm to feel the air quick with shapes we cannot see, and glorious with faces whose light serene we cannot catch."*

Dr. F. W. Krummacher tells, with a defence, of the habit of Oberlin in which that great missionary and saint manifested his firm belief in the continued association with the dead. "By a sudden stroke he lost what was called by him his dearest treasure on earth. His faithful companion and untiring helper in every enterprise was taken away. He could not be comforted. He was unspeakably desolate. She was the repository of his most secret thoughts and plans. To her he spoke with confidence of everything that occupied or affected him. Her ever wise counsel he was accustomed faithfully to follow. Whither could he turn or where stand, now that she was gone? And what have we in his diary which has been preserved to us? Nothing less than that he lived through nine years in communion with the glorified one—now in dream, now in vision when he was awake—and that he continued to discuss with her every measure which he purposed. What he records of this is as it were a real occurrence. It were well before we dismiss this with the exclamation, "Phantasy!" "Delusion!" Hallucination!" to withhold our judgment over such a mysterious fact until it please God to show us more concerning the relations of the worlds visible and invisible than he has yet vouchsafed to tell."†

The Protestant Reformers found the invocation of the saints among the errors and abuses of the Romish Church. They saw that it was based upon the belief in the continued presence of the saints with the Church on earth. They found what seemed to them no clear scripture proofs for the opinion, and in their zeal to correct the abuses, assailed the foundation. They dog-

*Oration, July 1876. Quoted from Mulford.
‡Lives of the Leaders of the Church Universal.

matically denied where only suspended faith was warranted. There is no necessary connection between the opinion and the practice of praying to the dead. We may hold the one without falling into the other.

The proof is strong but not irresistible. There is room for doubt. Only a strong degree of probability can be claimed for the belief. Neither reason nor Scripture forbid it. Both encourage it. We may, with a large majority of the Church, including many eminent Protestant theologians, hold it and draw comfort from it without being justly exposed to the charge of superstition or opposition to the Scriptures.

ARTICLE II.

PHILIP MELANCHTHON.

By Rev. William Kelly.

The events of the sixteenth century will always claim the attention and command the interest of the Christian world. The stirring incidents it commemorates, and the forces then set in motion, cause it to rank in importance only second to the first century of the Christian era. It marks the turn of tide in the stream of history; it stands as the point of a new departure in the annals of time;—the period of cleavage between two great epochs. On one side of the dividing line are the forces and ages of moral, spiritual, civil and intellectual darkness, civil and ecclesiastical despotism; on the other are ranged the forces and centuries of moral, spiritual, civil and intellectual light, civil and religious liberty. The century itself, transitional in its events, marks the point of departure from one period, and advancement toward the other. Side by side with the stirring incidents of this era, are the names and achievements of certain individuals, who were largely instrumental in shaping the course of its events. Two names especially loom prominently into view, as two lofty mountain peaks lift themselves above the surrounding hills, the names of Martin Luther and Philip Melanchthon. The latter is the subject of this article.

Philip Schwartzerd, changed to Philip Melanchthon, was born on the sixteenth of February, 1497, in the village of Bretten, and Duchy of Baden. His mother, Barbara Reuter Schwartzerd, was of a good family; his father, George Schwartzerd, a cultured and scholarly gentleman, was in the military employ of the Palatine princes, holding the position of armorer. From his earliest years, the son of the armorer displayed a precocious intellect, thirsting for knowledge, and naturally studious. He easily distanced his young competitors in the race of intellect; and so rapid was his mental development that at the early age of ten, we find him attending the Latin School of Pfortzheim, where he studied two years under the tutelage of John Hungarius. Having lost his father when but eleven years of age, John Reuchlin, his uncle, one of the most scholarly men of the period, directed his studies, which were so successfully prosecuted at the university of Heidelberg, where he matriculated in 1509, that one year later he composed a Latin comedy, and at fourteen years of age attained the degree of Bachelor of Arts. The custom of adopting Greek surnames being in vogue among the learned, the name Melanchthon, equivalent to Schwartzerd, signifying black earth, was conferred on Philip by Reuchlin. The Master's degree being refused him at Heidelberg, in spite of his attainments, because he was deemed too young to receive that honor, Melanchthon entered the University of Tübingen at fifteen years of age where, two years later, in 1514, he obtained the coveted degree of Master of Arts; and at nineteen years of age was made a Doctor of Philosophy.

At Tübingen he became interested in the subject of theology, a study that possessed for him a peculiar fascination, and in which he attained such marked proficiency that one of his titles is, The Theologian of the Reformation. Dr. Fisher, declares that "next to Luther, Melanchthon was the leading expounder of doctrine on the Lutheran side of the controversy;" a judgment in which all acquainted with his life and familiar with the events of the Reformation history will unanimously concur. While at Tübingen Melanchthon again entered the realm of authorship, giving to the world an edition of Terence and a grammar of the Greek

language. Refusing calls to professorial chairs in the universities of Ingolstadt and Leipsic, Melanchthon, in 1518, at the age of twenty-one, became Professor of Greek at Wittenberg, entering on the duties of his office in August of that year. Here he formed the acquaintance of Luther, who was Professor of Theology in the same University. The intimacy of these eminent men speedily ripened into mutual esteem, and resulted in a lifelong friendship. Each seemed necessary to the other; and the devout and thoughtful student of history will discern a special providence in the bringing together of these kindred souls. Dr. Sprecher writes: "A wonderful interposition of a higher hand is to be seen in the friendship formed between the man of the enthusiastic Propheteia, with the man of Didaskalia—the miner's son, who brought the metal of faith out of the deep shaft, and the armorer's son, who fashioned it into weapons of defence and offence." Merle D'Aubigne exclaims: "We cannot too much admire the goodness and wisdom of God, in bringing together men so different, and yet so necessary to each other. Luther possessed warmth, vigor and strength; Melanchthon, clearness, discretion and mildness. Luther gave energy to Melanchthon, Melanchthon moderated Luther. They were like substances in a state of positive and negative electricity, which mutually act upon each other."

Besides filling the chair of Greek Melanchthon taught the Latin classics and rhetoric in the University. The impression created by the young professor on his first appearance at Wittenberg, was far from flattering; his slight frame, small stature, extreme youth and diffident manner, caused a feeling of disappointment among professors and students. Even Luther is reported to have judged unfavorably of the new member of the Faculty; and the question was generally asked, "Is this the great doctor commended so highly by Reuchlin and Erasmus?" But when, a few days later, the new professor delivered his inaugural, *De corrigendis adolescentiæ studiis*, the first unfavorable impression gave place to sentiments of admiration. The clearness, depth, originality and finish of the Latin oration took the

University by storm, and, like the Trojans listening to the eloquence of Ulysses,

> "Wond'ring they heard, and fixed in deep surprise,
> Their ears refute the censure of their eyes."

Luther especially was impressed with the scholarly attainments and ability of the young man. Writing to Spalatin he says: "Melanchthon delivered so learned and beautiful a discourse that all listened with astonishment and admiration; we praise and admire his eloquence. I ask for no other Greek master." The impression made on this occasion continued to gain strength. Students from all parts of Europe, to the number of nearly two thousand, attracted by the fame of the young professor, crowded to Wittenberg to attend the lectures on Terence and Vergil, on Titus and Homer; while, like Solomon, Melanchthon, to use his own expression, "sought to bring from the Greek bard Tyrian brass and purple, for the adornment of God's house," Herbrand tells us that not only barons and counts but even princes were to be found in the throng of students." Fisher informs us that "not only Germans and Swiss, but even Italians" studied at Wittenberg. And Luther writes: "His lecture room is always full. All the theologians go to hear him. He is making every class, upper, middle, lower, begin to learn Greek.

About this time in 1520, Melanchthon was happily joined in wedlock to Catharine Krapp, a young woman belonging to one of the best families of Wittenberg. But, however interesting may be Melanchthon's life viewed in connection with his profession, the principal interest in his career arises from the fact that, next to Luther, he was the chief human agent in the work of the great Reformation.

To the part taken by him in this work we now turn. Almost from the beginning of their acquaintanceship, Luther and Melanchthon were mutually attracted—the stronger nature at first by scholastic admiration, the weaker by a feeling of respect and love. Luther was the Peter, but with more courage and steadiness than that apostle; Melanchthon was the John of love and Paul of learning of the Reformation epoch. Melanchthon was led by Luther to a deeper study of the Scriptures; he also em-

braced Luther's opinions on the necessity of ecclesiastical reform. His first appearance in connection with the Reformation, was at the discussion of Leipsic in 1519, between Eckius of Ingoldstadt, the champion of the papacy, and Bodenstein and Luther. While attending this discussion ostensibly as a spectator, Melanchthon nevertheless assisted Carlstadt by pertinent suggestions, till the irritated Eck cried, "Be silent, Philip, mind your own studies, and do not disturb me." Not long after the French Sorbonne declared Luther a heretic, Melanchthon stepped forward in defence of his friend, in his reply to the French theologians clearly proving that Luther, standing with Paul and the apostles on the foundation of God's truth, was a genuine professor of Christian doctrine, and that the real heretics were those who, denying the sufficiency of the word of inspiration, sought to establish their contention by constant appeals to the fathers and councils of the Church.

From this time on we find him almost incessantly standing with Luther in the very thick of the controversial conflict waged with the power of Rome, consecrating himself wholly to the task God had assigned him as a champion of the truth. At the Diet of Spires, and Conference of Marburg in 1529; at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530; at Smalkald in 1537; at Hagenau in 1540, at Worms and Ratisbon in 1541; and again at Worms later, Melanchthon stood by the side of Luther contending for the faith once delivered to the saints. In each separate contest he proved himself a valiant champion of the cause of reform. His logical ability, self-control, command of language, skill in debate, familiarity with the subjects under discussion, retentive memory, and intimate knowledge of the Scriptures rendered him a formidable adversary, few cared to encounter, and none could overthrow. In all questions of importance his opinion was sought, his judgment generally approved, and his decisions adopted by his associates. So general and favorable was the opinion entertained of his ability and judgment that several of the chief rulers of Europe appealed to him for advice in the solution of state, educational and religious problems. Francis the First, with the doctors of the Sorbonne, in 1535, invited him to

France. Henry the Eighth and Cranmer appealed to him to visit England, to assist the English theologians in preparing the Creed of the English Church. Herman, Archbishop of Cologne, in 1539, invoked his aid in the reformation of his diocese, and again four years later requested him to draw up a form of doctrine and worship for the Church of Cologne. In 1556 Maximilian, king of Bohemia, wrote to Melanchthon for a solution of the questions in dispute between the Reformers and the Papacy. While at the Diet of Worms, in 1557, he was appointed as one of the commissioners to represent the Protestant party.

But great as were the services rendered by Melanchthon to the cause of reform by his participation in the debates at the various conventions, it was chiefly by his writings that he achieved his highest fame, exercised the widest influence, acquired the esteem of contemporaries, aided most signally in the reform of the Church, overthrew the sophistries of the Roman advocates, gave to the Church in the Augsburg Confession a sound doctrinal basis, established only on the imperishable foundation of the word of God—a system which has already stood the test of four centuries of criticism, and will continue to endure to the end of time. As an author Melanchthon stands almost preëminent above the writers of his day, prolific as was that era in men of genius. Even the erudite and polished Erasmus yields to him in this particular. An accomplished master of Latin and Greek, as well as German, he not only merited by his writings the lofty title of Preceptor Germaniæ, but earned the far greater honor of being styled "The Pen of the Reformation." In his first address to the Sorbonne in defence of Luther he shows the vigor of a powerful and philosophical mind and the brilliancy of a polished rhetorician. From 1522 to 1534 he assisted in the translation of the Bible, collating the Greek and revising the work of Luther. It was the same great author, who in 1521 prepared the first treatise of Systematic Evangelical Theology, not based on the works of the schoolmen, but from the biblical standpoint, the *Loci Communes*, a work concerning which Luther writes: "The student of theology now

has greater advantages than ever before. First, he has the Bible, which I have translated from Hebrew into German; next he has Melanchthon's *Loci Communes.* Once master of these two volumes, he may be considered a theologian neither devil nor heretic can overcome; all the Fathers combined are not to be compared to Melanchthon's book." Calvin, who published in Geneva an edition of this work, says: "It is a summary of those truths which are essential to the Christian's guidance in the way of salvation.

In the year 1528 he also drew up a series of rules, doctrine and discipline for the Saxon church. In addition to the works referred to, Melanchthon is the author of several commentaries of great merit for the time in which they were written, a number of ethical, philosophical and controversial works, and the *Confessio Saxonica,* a statement of the Protestant faith drawn up for presentation to the Council of Trent.

But the works by which he is most favorably known and on which are based his fame as a theologian, are the Augsburg Confession and the Apology to that Confession. The Augsburg Confession, not only the acknowledged doctrinal standard of the Lutheran Church, but the source from which many confessions of Protestantism have largely drawn their inspiration, was written in 1530, in the city in Bavaria, from which it takes its name, a diet having been convened in Augsburg to arrange for enforcing the decrees of the Diet of Worms and to bring the Church of Germany into allegiance with Rome. The Protestant powers prepared for the struggle by drawing up a confession of faith to present to the Emperor and Diet. The task of preparing this confession was assigned to Melanchthon. D'Aubigne gives the following graphic description of the preparation of that document: "One man of small stature, frail, timid, and in great alarm, was commissioned to prepare this instrument of war. Philip Melanchthon worked at it night and day; he weighed every expression, softened it down, changed it, and then frequently returned to his first idea. He was wasting away, his friends trembled lest he should die over his task, and Luther enjoined him as early as the 12th of May to care for his body.

Notwithstanding these solicitations Melanchthon's application increased. At Coburg he had already put his hand to the task, tracing out in the first part the doctrines of the faith according to the Articles of Schwabach; and, in the second, the abuses of the Church, according to the Torgau Articles. At Augsburg he gave a new and more elegant form to this Confession. The Augsburg Confession was completed on the 11th of May, sent to Luther for revision, and returned by Luther with the statement, "I have read Master Philip's Apology [the name first given it]. I like it well enough, and have no corrections to make." The Confession was presented to the Diet on the 25th of June, a day of which D'Aubigne says: "This was destined to be the greatest day of the Reformation, one of the most glorious in the history of Christianity and mankind." The Papists having prepared a so-called confutation, Melanchthon wrote, in reply, the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, an admirable paper, worthy the piety, learning and reputation of its author.

In these masterly productions of the great theologian, his genius shines forth with fullest blaze. The learned Bossuet, Roman Catholic bishop of Meaux, says: "The Augsburg Confession is the most considerable of all, in every respect. Besides that it was first presented and subscribed by a greater body, it has also this advantage, that it was considered by Bucer, and by Calvin himself, as a work common to the Reformation." D'Aubigne exclaims, "This Confession of Augsburg will ever remain one of the masterpieces of the human mind enlightened by the Spirit of God." Kurtz writes: "This compact, lucid document, as decided as it was mild, received the full approval of Luther. It made a favorable impression on the assembled princes; whilst the evangelical confessors felt themselves greatly strengthened by the confession of their faith before the emperor and nation." Archbishop Lawrence, of the Church of England, speaks of "that boast of Germany and pride of the Reformation, the Augsburg Confession." Dr. John G. Morris characterized the Augsburg Confession as the "doctrinal Magna Charta of all Protestantdom." The following incident shows the impression produced by the first presentation of this memorable document: "When

the Chancellor of Saxony had finished its reading, the Duke of Bavaria asked Eck whether that doctrine could be overthrown out of the Holy Scriptures? "No!" was the reply of Eck, "we cannot overthrow it by the Scriptures, but we may by appeal to the Fathers." On hearing this reply, the Duke exclaimed: "See how finely our divines support us; the Protestants prove their contention by Scripture; we have our doctrine without the Scripture."

Valuable however as were the services of Melanchthon in the Reformation of the Church, he was not a Luther and could never have performed the work accomplished by his greater co-adjutor. No one appreciated this fact better than Melanchthon himself. With all his admirable qualities he was somewhat deficient in firmness. He lacked the spirit of positive, unyielding, indomitable and heroic constancy, so characteristic of Luther. The two chief Reformers were cast in widely different molds. While the nature of Luther displayed the hardy vigor of the oak, Melanchthon's occasionally showed the pliancy of the reed. This is abundantly attested by the annals of the time. It is a notable fact that in great emergencies, when Luther was absent, and after his decease, Melanchthon exhibited at times a want of firmness, a spirit of faint-heartedness and wavering tendencies that almost imperiled the success of the Reformation. We see his faint-heartedness during the period of Luther's retirement in the Wartburg after the Diet of Worms; when the Anabaptist fanaticism gained a partial ascendancy even at Wittenberg; and before and after the Diet of Augsburg, when almost despairing of ultimate success, he appeared ready to make concessions to the papacy that would have materially injured the Protestant cause; in the controversies that sprang up in the Church after the death of Luther, almost imperiling its very existence; in the Adiaphoristic controversy, from 1548 to 1555, concerning the admissibility of Catholic forms in the constitution and worship of the Church; in the Majoristic controversy, from 1551 to 1562, turning on the necessity of good works; in the Synergistic controversy, from 1555 to 1567, concerning the freedom of the will; in the Crypto Calvinistic controversy, from 1552 to 1574,

concerning the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. It is a well known fact that the anabaptist fanaticism acquired its influence and gained ground while Luther was at the Wartburg with Melanchthon at the head of affairs; and that on the return of Luther to Wittenberg it immediately lost its influence: and that the weakness shown by him during the meeting of the Augsburg Diet, and the periods known as the Augsburg and Leipsic Interim was nearly always manifested in Luther's absence. It is known, too, that the four great controversies mentioned, which tended to tarnish Melanchthon's fame, took place after the death of Luther. D'Aubigne acknowledges that "Melanchthon after the death of Luther hesitated and gave way; even where he should not have yielded." Without the strong faith and courage of Luther to assist him, Melanchthon seemed as little able to conduct the movement of reform, as Phaeton without the assistance of Apollo, was capable of driving the chariot of the sun. Realizing his own weakness, he leaned on Luther, regarding him as God's principal agent in the prosecution of the work. During the Wartburg period he wrote to a friend: "Our Elijah is at a distance from us, his absence absolutely torments me." At Augsburg he writes to Luther at Coburg: "O, my father, I do not wish to exaggerate my sorrows, but, without your consolations, it is impossible for me here to enjoy the least peace." His admiration for Luther and confidence in his steadiness breaks out in the sentence: "Nothing can terrify Martin Luther, who would willingly purchase the glory of the gospel at the price of his blood." At an earlier period he exclaims: "If there is anyone I dearly love and embrace with my whole heart, it is Martin Luther." Overwhelmed at the thought of the loss he had sustained in the death of the great reformer, he utters the cry of Elisha at the departure of Elijah: "My father! My father! the chariots of Israel, and the horsemen thereof." In his funeral oration over the remains of his friend, he speaks of him tenderly as "Our most beloved father and teacher." On another occasion he wrote: "I should rather die than be torn from Luther." Thus loving, revering, admiring and trusting, Melanchthon was willing to occupy the second position, instead of aspiring to that

of leadership in the labor of reform. These noble spirited men were bound inseparably in a covenant of love, the affection shown by Melanchthon, being fully reciprocated by Luther, who writes: "Whatever we know in the arts and true philosophy, we owe to Philip. In the wide world, the sun shines on no man who has such gifts as Philip. He that lightly esteems him, must be lightly esteemed before God."

One of the most important of the later works of Melanchthon, was the preparation in 1551 of the Confessio Saxonica, for presentation to the Council of Trent. This confession written at Wittenberg, was read before the Elector and Lutheran Theologians at Leipsic, receiving their unanimous and cordial approval. Melanchthon himself styled this confession, the Repetitio Confessionis Augustanæ. Of this confession, Kurtz says, "In it we discern no trace of the vacillation and duplicity of the Leipsic Interim. On the contrary, the true doctrine is set forth positively and polemically with firmness and confidence; though in moderate and conciliatory terms." His last public conference with the Papal party was held at Worms in 1557. The subject of discussion was, The rule for judging in matters of religion. In this controversy, the Papists as usual upheld the authority of the Church, while the Lutherans with equal unanimity affirmed, that the only infallible rule for guidance in doctrine and worship was the written word of God! But his work was nearly done; the days of Melanchthon, so abundant in labor and fruitful in results, were drawing to a close; his last years were embittered by the controversies prevailing in the Protestant Church, and the personal abuse heaped upon him by the papists on the one hand, and those who accused him of departing from genuine Lutheranism on the other, so that he longed for death. A few days before his departure, he penned his reasons for not fearing death, in two columns. The first column contained the six following reasons. "First: We shall come to the light. Second: We shall see God. Third: We shall contemplate the Son of God. Fourth: We shall understand the mysteries we could not comprehend in this life. Fifth: We shall know why we are created such as we are. Sixth: We shall comprehend the union of the

two natures in Christ. The second column contained but two reasons, First: We shall no longer sin. Second: We shall be delivered from controversies, and the rage of theologians." His last day of life was spent in prayer, and the reading of God's word. His celebrated reply to Casper Peucer, who asked "if he desired anything"—"Nothing but heaven,"—has become historic. At length on the nineteenth day of April, 1560, at a quarter before seven in the evening, the spirit of Melanchthon took its flight, in the sixty-fourth year of his age. His exact age was sixty-three years, two months, and three days. His last word, addressed to Vitus Winshemius, who asked if he understood the Scripture reading, was the German word, Ya! His remains, placed in a leaden casket, after a sermon by Paul Eberus, and an oration by Winshemius, were deposited by the side of Luther, in the Church at Wittenberg; where his ashes still repose. Above his resting place is carved the following epitaph:

> "Hic invicte, tuus collega, Luthere, Melanchthon
> Non procul a tumulo conditur ipse tuo.
> Ut pia doctrinæ concordia junxerat ambos,
> Sic sacer amborum jungit hic ossa locus,"

of which the following is a somewhat free translation: Here, unconquered Luther, thy colleague, Melanchthon himself, lies buried not far from thy tomb. As holy harmony in doctrine had united both, so this sacred spot unites the bodies of both.

In a study of Melancthon's life, his chief characteristics claim our attention. We notice, first, his great industry and constant application; not even Luther could excel him in these directions. His entire life was one of activity; each day being devoted to some useful employment. With a frail body, he was an intellectual Hercules. The marvel is, how, with so delicate a frame, he managed to perform such incessant and exhausting labors. One of his biographers says: "Like the apostles, he was instant in season and out of season; to counsel with tongue or pen, to travel, attend private conference or public council, neither time nor labor was grudged, if it could be used in promoting the peace and purity of the Church." He was a man of candor. The thoughts he expressed were the convictions of

his intellect and heart. If he sometimes sacrificed his own convictions, it was only to promote the peace and welfare of the Church. Along what he regarded as lines of secondary importance, where principles he deemed vital and fundamental were at stake, Melanchthon could stand as firm as Luther. In a letter to Granville, the imperial commissioner, he declares his abhorrence of all evasion, mental reservation, or any species of disingenuousness, in public disputation or private conference. He was a man of great humility. This quality he daily manifested. Says one of his admirers: "Humility was one of the signal features of his character. In him we have no great impressive personality, winning his way by massive strength of resolution and energy; but a noble personality we cannot study without respect and love." The piety of Melanchthon was deep and unaffected. Loving God's cause, God's word and Church, he was willing to sacrifice all, even life itself, for the sake of truth and righteousness. Modesty was one of the predominant qualities of his nature. A striking incident illustrates this attribute. At the Diet of Ratisbon, when Eck put to him a difficult question, Melanchthon, after a pause, replied, I will answer you tomorrow. Oh, said Eck, with a sneer, "There is no honor in that." "Good Doctor," was the memorable reply, "I am not seeking personal glory in this matter, but defending the truth; I say then, God willing, you shall have an answer to-morrow."

A man of unusual mildness, he occasionally erred in giving too free scope to this amiable quality. And yet, while regretting the extent to which he carried this characteristic, for it led him sometimes too far in the path of conciliation, we admire and love him for the amiability he possessed in so prëeminent a degree. It is recorded that his meek and quiet spirit never forsook him.

He always engaged reluctantly in disputation, and no matter how hard pressed, never manifested irritation in the least degree. This quality was strikingly displayed during the Adiaphoristic controversy, in a letter to Flaccius in which he writes: "I yield, I contend no longer about these *rites;* I am chiefly solicitous that the churches live in concord and peace." Schaff

says: "Nothing is more prominent in Melanchthon's temper than its irenic tone. He was mild by nature, and shunned contentions and divisions. And yet in spite of his mildness his life was a conflict: he himself with Luther was a centre around which circled the storm currents of strife."

Despite his conciliatory tendencies, however, he could be both sharp as well as firm, when occasion required. Where, for instance, even in the sayings of Luther himself, will you find keener and crisper sentences than these: Disputing with an Italian on Transubstantiation, he exclaims, "How is it you Italians will have a God in the bread, since you do not believe there is a God in heaven." Again, "There is no more reason for adoring the bread in the sacrament of the supper, than water in the sacrament of baptism." Again to Eck, at Ratisbon: "The sacrament, has no significance beyond its divinely appointed use, and Christ is not present for the sake of the bread, but of the recipient." This statement staggered even Eck, set Granville to thinking, and filled Luther with such admiration that he exclaimed in ecstacy: "Admirable Philip! Thou hast seized from the Popedom what I should not have ventured to attempt."

In forming an opinion of the great men of history, we should know how they were regarded by the men of their day, as well as by those of a subsequent era. The data from which to form our judgment of Melanchthon from the sources indicated is excellent, and abundant. From the mass of testimonials we have but time and space to refer to but few. Let us start with Erasmus. In the very morning of Melanchthon's life, when he was but eighteen years of age, the renowned scholar of Rotterdam writes: "What hopes may we not conceive of Philip Melanchthon, almost a boy, and yet to be equally admired in both languages (Latin and Greek). What quickness of invention, purity of diction, vastness of memory, and variety of reading, what modesty and gracefulness of behavior, and what a princely mind. God grant that this young man may long survive us. He will entirely eclipse Erasmus." "Thanks to him," writes Plank, "Wittenberg became the school of the nation." Luther exclaims:

"The whole Christian world is his debtor; and, thanks be to God, the popish fraternity are more afraid of him, than all the learned beside combined." Again Luther wrote: "*Res et verba, Philippus; verba, sine rebus, Erasmus; res, sine verbis, Lutherus; nec res, nec verba, Carolostadius.*" (Philip, is both substance and words; Erasmus, words without substance; Luther, substance without words; Carlstadt, neither substance nor words.) Again writing to Melanchthon from the Wartburg, Luther shows his appreciation of his coadjutor in the words: "If I perish, the Gospel of Christ will not perish; and you, I hope, like another Elisha, will succeed Elijah." Bossuet speaks of Melanchthon as the most able and zealous follower of Luther; the most eloquent, polite, and moderate follower of the Saxon reformer. Mosheim exclaims: "His greatest enemies have borne testimony to his merit; they have been forced to acknowledge, that the annals of antiquity exhibits but few worthies to be compared with him." Archbishop Lawrence of the Church of England says: "Melanchthon possessed every requisite to render truth alluring, and the Reformation respectable." Kurtz writes: "He was an Erasmus of loftier power and nobler mien, a complementary counterpart of Luther." Luther and Erasmus both lauded his talents, his fine culture, and learning, and his age pronounced him "Preceptor Germaniæ." Fisher, of Yale, says: "He had a fine but cautious intellect, and exact and ample learning. He won fame alike as theologian and expositor. His commentary on the Epistle to the Romans laid the foundation of Protestant exegesis." The highest compliment Hugh Miller can pay to Dr. Gordon, one of the heroes of the Kirk, is to say: "He had a head of the Melanchthon type—high, erect, with an overpowering superstructure of sentiment." Schaff pays him the high compliment by declaring: "Melanchthon's moderation and conservative tendency were as necessary to the success of the Reformation as were Luther's heroism of faith and bold and military nature." Luther writes: "I was bound to fight with rabble and devils; for which reason my books are very belligerent. I am the rough pioneer who must break ground; but master Philip comes along softly and gently; sows and waters

heartily, since God has richly endowed him with gifts." "Our Philip Melanchthon," again writes Luther, "is a wonderful man, having scarcely a single quality, in which he does not surpass all other men. Rich in learning, in Latin, in Greek, young only in years, familiar with all books in every department, acquainted not only with the classic tongues, but possessed of their treasures, and not a stranger even to the Hebrew tongue. Though I be a master of arts, of philosophy, and theology, I give up my opinion at the dissent of this grammatist, as Eck calls him; I have done it often, I do it daily, for the sake of that divine treasure which God has poured into this earthen vessel. It is not Philip I honor, it is the work of God in him I revere."

Such are a few of the opinions concerning this man by those best qualified to render an intelligent and impartial judgment. And we who at the distance of four centuries study his character, labors, influence, and life, are forced to acquiesce in the favorable opinions, so forcibly expressed by the ablest men of the present and the past.

We have witnessed the influence of Melanchthon's work in the Reformation era. It will be germane at this time to inquire, what influence, if any, does he exercise in the Church of to-day? We hesitate not to declare that Melanchthon's influence instead of waning, in some directions at least, is still in the ascendant. By virtue of the fact that the Augsburg Confession, written by him, is not only the doctrinal standard of the Lutheran Church throughout the entire world, but the source from which the Church of England drew the Thirty-Nine Articles of the English confession, as Archbishop Lawrence of that church frankly acknowledges in his Bampton Lectures, and as Dr. Fisher asserts in his history of the Church, the influence of Melanchthon will continue to be felt, as long as these great churches continue to endure. But with the churches mentioned, that influence does not stop. The twenty-five articles of Methodism, largely based on the Thirty-Nine Articles of Anglicanism, may with justice be claimed indirectly at least, as an outgrowth of the Augsburg Confession, so that the Methodist Church also is indebted to Melanchthon. The slightest acquaint-

ance with the Westminster Confession, with the Dort and Heidelberg Catechisms, will show numerous phases in which these confessions agree with the confession of Augsburg, and, as the latter was the first prepared of all the confessions named, it is safe to say, that the Augsburg Confession was consulted by the authors of the later confessions, and that the portions in such confessions agreeing with the Confession of Augsburg, were substantially drafted from that Confession into the later productions. Kurtz says: "The Reformed Church of Germany occupied from the beginning a middle position between Calvinism and Lutheranism, which was closely related to Melanchthonianism." Dr. George P. Fisher, writing of the Mercersburg Theology, says: "Into the Heidelberg Catechism, the Creed of the German Reformed Church, there had flowed influences from the school of Melanchthon." He also states, that as against Calvinism, Melanchthonianism was brought by that theology, (the Mercersburg) into the foreground. This statement, if correct, shows that even as against Calvin, Melanchthon's influence is predominant, even in the school of Nevin and Schaff.

It is now pertinent to ask the question, how should Melanchthon be regarded by Lutherans? What position is he entitled to occupy in the estimation of the Lutheran Church? It is a well known fact, that after Luther's death, Melanchthon in his desire to conciliate all parties, thus promoting peace and unity in the Church, made concessions, which, instead of accomplishing the end contemplated, lent color to the charge that he had abandoned the Lutheran position on the sacrament, and tended to alienate from him the affections of the more determined followers of Luther. So bitter was the feeling excited against him in ultra Lutheran circles, that Dr. Leonard Hutter, Professor at Wittenberg, in the early part of the seventeenth century when the authority of Melanchthon was appealed to in his presence, tore down Melanchthon's picture from the wall and trampled it under foot. But the tide of opinion has long since turned in his favor; and in this four hundredth anniversary year of his birth; in spite of his mistakes and failings, we hail him as a true Lutheran, a devout and earnest Christian, a genuine man of God,

a true spiritual hero, the second champion of the German Reformation, the life-long friend, faithful coadjutor and unflinching defender of the prince of reformers. Theologically and historically it is impossible to separate him from Luther. It has been well said of these eminent men: "They were not always perfectly agreed, but always perfectly united; that the miner's son drew forth the metal (of truth) and the armorer's son fashioned it." There are pairs of names and personal histories so inseparable blended and interwoven, that the mention of one invariably recalls the other. David recalls Jonathan; Damon, Pythias; Peter, John; Paul, Timothy; Washington, Lafayette; Luther, Melanchthon. The last two taught together in the same university, translated together the word of God, battled together for the overthrow of error and the establishment of God's truth. Together they stood before kings, rulers, magistrates, hierarchies, potentates of all kinds, secular and ecclesiastical. Together they prepared sundry manuals of religious instruction, that the people might be grounded in the holy principles of the oracles of God. Together they gave to the world "the greatest of uninspired documents," the Augsburg Confession. Inseparable in life, they are inseparable in death; their bones mingle in the same sepulchre; side by side they sleep the tranquil sleep of the just. So long as the principles of that great Reformation shall endure, so long will the names of Luther and Melanchthon be held in honor and their memories be revered.

It will not be deemed inappropriate in closing this article to consider briefly the question: Did Melanchthon, late in life, abandon the Lutheran view of the real presence in the Eucharist for the Calvinistic conception of the mere spiritual presence of Christ? The Calvinistic church holds to to the affirmative of this question, and the opinion generally prevails in that communion that their contention is true. We think, however, it can be clearly shown that such was not the case. The impression that Melanchthon changed his ground in the direction mentioned, originated in two different ways: First, because of his personal friendship for Calvin, and his ardent desire to unify the Church,

Melanchthon refused to condemn the Calvinistic view of the sacrament, thus lending color to the idea, that he endorsed that view. Secondly, Casper Peucer, Melanchthon's son-in-law, who himself became a Calvinist, publicly announced that Melanchthon also had adopted the same opinions. This however was after the death of Melanchthon, when the latter of course could neither affirm nor deny the statement.

We answer the charge that Melanchthon became a Calvinist as follows: At no time in his entire life, can it be shown that in his views of the sacrament, Melanchthon openly declared, I endorse the view of Calvin. Regarding the first point mentioned, Kurtz explains Melanchthon's position as follows: "It was Melanchthon's most ardent desire to effect such a union (of the Church). He became convinced, not indeed that the Lutheran doctrine of the real presence was erroneous, but that Calvin's doctrine of a spiritual participation of the body and blood of Christ (through faith) in the Supper, did violence to no essential religious point; therefore he sought to avoid what seemed to him an unessential difference in confession and doctrine." Schaff says: "The personal presence of Christ, and the impartation of himself in the Lord's Supper, were matters of supreme importance with him." Again, "*Above all*, he made prominent the union with Christ and the mystical body, but he always seems to represent this as mediated by a carnal impartation by Christ of himself."* These statements of Kurtz and Schaff show that in the opinion of these eminent historians, Melanchthon was simply induced to withhold his censure of the Calvinistic view, in the interest of peace, and with the design of avoiding controversy, and that he retained his personal belief in the biblical and Lutheran position of the Lord's Supper. So that the contention of the Calvinists, that Melanchthon abandoned the Lutheran view, because he did not openly oppose the Calvinistic theory, falls to the ground. It is poor logic to claim, that whosoever does not openly condemn a theory, must necessarily himself be an advocate of that theory.

*Kurtz's Ch. His. Vol. 2, pages 136, 137, Edition, 1871. Cyclo. of Reli. Knowledge, vol. 2, Page 1459.

Regarding Peucer's claim that Melanchthon had embraced the Calvinistic view of the sacrament, we reply: "First, that Peucer and Melanchthon were separated from each other for years; and that Peucer's opportunities for understanding the doctrinal position of his father-in-law were not greater than those enjoyed by many who never ceased to regard Melanchthon as a Lutheran. Secondly, Peucer being a layman, immersed in his medical calling, and not a theologian, might easily have been mistaken in his judgment concerning Melanchthon's position. Thirdly, without desiring to be uncharitable, it is possible to conceive that Peucer, having embraced Calvinism, might be tempted to excuse his own change of belief, by ranging Melanchthon on the same side. But apart from these conjectures, we have what we consider the most direct testimony in opposition to the Calvinistic claim. In addition to the testimony of Kurtz and Schaff already cited in favor of Melanchthon's Lutheranism, the learned Bishop Bossuet writes: "Calvin obstinately maintained that a believer once regenerated could not fall from grace; Melanchthon agreed with the Lutherans, that this doctrine was damnable and impious. Calvin could not endure the necessity of Baptism, and Melanchthon would never depart from it. Calvin condemned what Melanchthon taught on the coöperation of free will, and Melanchthon believed he could not recant. *As for what concerns the Supper, Calvin boasts that Melanchthon was of his opinion; but as he does not produce one word of Melanchthon's clearly to that purpose, but on the contrary taxes him in all his letters and books with having never explained himself sufficiently on that subject, methinks one may reasonably doubt of what he has advanced. * * I shall only say, what candor and truth oblige me to, viz., that I have nowhere found in any of the author's [Melanchthon's] writings, that Jesus Christ is not received, except by faith. * * Neither do I find that he has ever said, with those who maintain it, that the unworthy do not receive the true body and true blood; but on the contrary, it appears to me that he persisted in what was determined on this subject in the Wittenberg agreement.*"* This impartial opinion of the great Catholic his-

*Bossuet's Variees, Vol. 1, 293–94.

torian should settle the question of Melanchthon's Lutheranism in every unbiased mind. Schaff says (Cyclope. of Relig. Knowledge, p. 1461.): "He [Melanchthon] insists on his doctrinal agreement with Luther;" and Dr. Schaff surely was thoroughly familiar with the doctrinal position Luther maintained. I have already called attention to the fact, that in 1551, five years after the death of Luther, Melanchthon drew up the *Confessio Saxonica*, which so entirely agreed with the Lutheran theology that it was unanimously approved by the Elector and Lutheran theologians. Six years later, in 1557, three years before his death, at the last Diet of Worms, he again signed the unaltered Augsburg Confession. In 1560, the year of his decease, he again signed the *Confessio Saxonica*, or as he styled it the *Repetitio Confessionis Augustanæ*. This last fact, apart from all other considerations should absolutely settle the question of Melanchthon's Lutheranism, and clear his reputation from whatever odium has been cast upon it in this respect. It shows clearly that in the sixty-fourth year of his age, the last of his earthly life, he placed himself on record as being a Lutheran and not a Calvinist. A few weeks before his death, he penned a last preface to his Body of Doctrines, embracing with other writings, the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Repetition of the Confession, and the Examen, all thoroughly Lutheran. In view, then, of the facts cited; in view also of the fact that Chemnitz and Chytræus, two of the most eminent Lutheran theologians of the sixteenth century, with Nicholas Selneccer, never doubted Melanchthon's Lutheranism; that Bossuet a Roman Catholic, Kurtz a Lutheran, and Schaff a Reformed historian, all acknowledge the Lutheranism of Melanchthon; that neither Calvin himself nor any of his followers have presented a single unquestioned fact corroborative of their claim that Melanchthon embraced Calvinism, we claim that, beyond all controversy, Melanchthon lived and died in the faith of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

ARTICLE III.

THE CLASSICAL LANGUAGES IN EDUCATION.*

By Rev. Prof. J. Howard Stough, Ph. D.

One of the first Latin sentences I learned, after I began the study of that language, was the familiar proverb, "*Tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis*—times are changed and we are changed in them." The first part is a truism as old as history; the latter part may be true or it may not. Times may change but man and human institutions may set themselves against these changes and preserve the features of a distant past amid the surroundings of the present. The great hermit nation of the East retreating behind its wall and sealing its ports against the outer world, for several millenniums stood still and uninfluenced by the vigorous, pulsing life of the West. Yet even that nation was reached at last, and it may be a question whether the silent influence of changes that occur about us can be finally and fully warded off. However this may be, it is true that changes as a rule come slowly. Reforms are not wrought rapidly. The masses tend toward conservatism. There will be those who, like Cicero, looking upon the present as a degenerate age and back to the splendor and strength of the past, will cry out in bitter irony, "*O tempora! O mores!*" and the aging men of every period will be found "praisers of the days when they were boys," but most men, whether young or in their prime, will be found according a hearty respect to that which has the sanction of antiquity. Hoary-headed age, whether in man or institutions, demands and merits reverence.

But there are some men who, in defiance of all precedent, strike out into new paths. The past is not infallible, and having discovered some real or fancied mistake in that past they often

*An address delivered at the opening of Midland College, Sept. 9, 1896.

proceed to discredit the whole. The powers of the human mind are beyond conception great, and all that the past has done and all that the daring present proposes to do has not exhausted those powers. And so there is a field for the reformer,—mistakes are to be set right; there is room for the progressive man,—new discoveries are to be made, new realms to be conquered. The one supplements the other. Without the radical the world would stagnate; without the conservative the world would run wild.

Of these two tendencies we have evidence on every side if we are but attentive to what is transpiring about us. We have a *new theology* which takes some remarkable liberties with God's word and, like the image breakers of the Middle Ages, would demolish some cherished ideas which we have inherited; but side by side with it we have an *old theology* which holds fast to the "faith once delivered to the saints," a theology which has been tried in storm and stress and gives firm anchorage to our faith. It is not strange, therefore, to find that we have also a *new education* as well as an *old education*, and that these are differentiated from each other in spirit, methods and aims. The one is iconoclastic, the other is conservative. But iconoclasm is usually destructive. Those wild men of the Middle Ages, who tore down the images and smashed the beautiful windows and hewed the carvings of the cathedrals, destroyed what they had not the skill to replace. Conservatism, on the other hand, may mean the truest progress. This question between the new and the old is exceeding broad and we may not venture upon it now. There is one feature of it, which touches our work of higher education, which is of special interest to us. It is the question of the *Classical Languages in Education.*

Before I can answer the question so often asked—"What is the use of Latin and Greek in these latter days?"—I must know what you set forth as the educational ideal, what is the thing aimed at in education. There is one side which arrogates to itself the name *practical*, which claims to represent the spirit of the age, and can see no good or advantage in the classics. In the view of these persons, time spent upon these languages as subjects

of study is simply time wasted. The touchstone by which they would test every subject is its *practical* value—its value in dollare and cents, its help in getting bread. Whatever does not bear directly upon this is to be discarded, and all human energy is to be concentrated upon "getting on in the world." The classic languages of Greece and Rome cannot be turned into dollars, either gold or silver, in the world's markets, and therefore are not to be sought for. They belong to a dark past, to those days when men believed in and sought for the philosopher's stone. The preservation of them in college courses is an anachronism—or, to use one of our vigorous and expressive slang terms, a "back number"—a fetich which college professors have succeeded in preserving till this day, and have imposed on the suffering generations lest they should lose their professional positions and salaries. They are out of all harmony with the aims and purposes of the coming century, as they have been the blight upon the growth and progress of education in the waning century. Such is the wail which the editor of *The Cosmopolitan* sends forth in a recent number in an article meant to be satirical, but too untrue for satire and too weak to pass as argument. And under the pressure of this intense commercial spirit great changes have been inaugurated. The great strides which the natural sciences have been making have naturally placed them in the front ranks as competitors for a place as educational agents. The result, however, is not reassuring. Pres. G. Stanley Hall, one of the leading authorities in this country on educational matters says: "Those sciences that bring bread have been taught and those that are educational have been dropped. Many of our institutions have dropped astronomy because it is not money making, because there is no astronomic industry. Organic chemistry has flourished like a green bay tree; inorganic chemistry which is more exact and more scientific has steadily declined. Electricity which happens to be a money making thing, has boomed everywhere. * * Go through the list of our American scientific studies. They are what the Germans call *bread studies*. We have weeded out educational studies. and brought the practical, money making studies into the fore-

ground, and many of our schools and teachers are in danger of sinking to be the tools or agents of the factories. The college has moved a great many leagues nearer the factory than it ever was before in this country."* This is expert testimony, not of a Greek Professor, but of a professional educator of national reputation, upon the tendencies of the new education.

Now there is another ideal which says that "*it is a greater thing to make a life than a living*," that man's mind was made to be something better than a counting machine, that conceives of his mission both for himself and his fellows as something higher than mere money making, that makes education as broad as man's nature and seeks to inform, to discipline and cultivate all his faculties. It is called *liberal* and is described by the one word *culture*.

If *the all* of education is simply to prepare for the active fight of life for bread and position and money, then my answer must necessarily be that there is little use for the classical languages. But it would be just as true that there is as little need of a great many of the branches which are just now contesting the ground with the classics. Mathematics saving the barest skeleton would have to go, for what man ever thinks of solving any of our practical problems by any but the simplest methods, and none but the engineer would have any need of any of the higher branches of that delectable science. And to the man whose mission is to buy and sell, or to dig and plow, or to wield the hammer or drive the engine, what *practical* benefit could come from Milton or Shakespeare, from browning or Tennyson, and with this great and glorious company must be thrust aside art and oratory, music and poetry. The man who is to measure off calico needs neither chemistry nor logic; the man who enters politics will find ethics very inconvenient to practice, and psychology for the blacksmith certainly is non-essential, while the lawyer and doctor will need enough mathematics of the simplest kind to figure out their bills and to reckon interest. Education by this standard becomes a very simple thing. Teach

*Report of Regents Univ., of N. Y., 1894, p. 305.

the thing the boy or girl will most need and which will aid most in the work of bread-winning and you have the whole thing in a nutshell. If such an education satisfies those who wish to thrust aside the Latin and the Greek, I am satisfied. But I would insist that they stand by their theory even though that practically reduces education to the three R's. However, it is safe to say that no one wants such an education; they want the privilege to be illogical and unreasonable in the choice of that which shall constitute an education.

Let me now take up some of the objections which are urged against the classics.

1 *They are a relic of the past, and a semi-barbarous past at that.* Latin and Greek were taught in the schools and universities partly because they had little else of a character suitable to be the subjects of study; and partly because these languages were then practical, for the Latin at least was everywhere spoken and was the language of the Church, the court, the palace, the school. To speak and write a pure Latin was an accomplishment of value, while to read and understand the Greek was the mark of the scholar. But times have changed. Latin is now a dead language. It is not needed "on change" or in the court-room. It should be laid aside with the battering-ram, the cross-bow, the Ptolemaic theory of the universe and the Pythagorean transmigration of souls as curiosities for the antiquarian. And this age, this wonderful age, this boasted and boastful nineteenth century, and these last days have ushered in such abounding wisdom that the veriest ignoramus "understands more than the ancients" and is wiser than all his teachers. And so the cry, "Away with the Latin! Away with the Greek! Away from the sixteenth century!" was started and many have joined in the hue and cry without stopping to ask whether there was any particularly sound reason for it or not. It is of the past, and the past ought to be labeled and shelved. That is reason enough.

But let us look soberly at it. Whether these languages were introduced for the reason given we may leave for the historian to settle, but the fact remains that they have been prominent factors in liberal culture for more than four centuries and during

all these years have maintained their place without question. Wm. H. Payne, formerly Prof. of Pedagogy in the University of Michigan and a prominent writer on educational topics, lays down as a fundamental principle that "*whatever policy has received the long sanction of the wise and good, is likely to have some elements of truth in it.*"* This seems reasonable, and on almost every other subject would be accepted without hesitation. Applying this principle, on *a priori* grounds, since the teaching of Latin and Greek has been long employed by the wisest, strongest, best teachers of the centuries past, has held its place during these years, it is likely that there was some good reason for its introduction and its continuance and that it is not so utterly foolish and useless as some would have us believe. The likelihood is that no amount of professional interest or scholastic pride, or conservatism could have stayed its downfall and saved it as a college fetich had it been without value. To impeach the honesty, the candor, the wisdom of the past generations, who have regarded these languages as one of the chief and best instruments of human culture, is both ungracious and a piece of foolishness which only the conceit of this age could produce.

2. *It is objected that students know but little about them when they are graduated, and that in a few years even that little has in most cases utterly vanished.*

Granting that this may be true, and yet by no means in as great a degree as is assumed, let us go aside a step and make a practical application of the principle that we may see how it works. You and I studied somewhere in the years that are past a process called the extraction of the cube root. Were I to put a problem on the board how many of you could step up and solve it without going back to the old arithmetic? Shall we therefore throw away that wholesome old book because we have forgotten most of its rules, or work out our problems by other and shorter methods? Some of us studied surveying and could accurately compute areas from a surveyor's note-book; or from given data we could figure out a ship's course or position in

*Contributions to Science of Education, p. 20.

longitude and latitude. But *to-day*, how about it? Once we could parse the long and involved sentences of Milton. But could we make even a creditable showing now? The *pons asinorum* was a famous proposition in geometry in my boyhood. Some of you doubtless have had some experience with it, but I doubt if there would be found, in every hundred, ten who retain any adequate idea of the method of proof, and a still smaller number who could give the wording of the proposition. And calculus, and the optical formulæ, and the chemical names and symbols, and the botanical terms, and the dates in history, and the formulæ of logic, and the definitions of rhetoric—where are they? Latin and Greek seem not to be the only things we learn only to forget. But shall we discard these subjects from our course of study because we will forget them? Certainly not; for these things belong to formal science and, while the matter may have disappeared, the *effect* of the study accompanies each intellectual act. Prof. Payne again says: "In the region of taste classical study is formative in as true a sense and in as great a degree as in the case of mathematical study; and if we admit, as I think it must be admitted that the better half of culture is concerned with taste, feeling and emotion, it follows that the classics are culture studies in a preëminent degree. So far is it from being true that the value of a subject for culture can be tested by the residue held in the memory, that *it may rather be affirmed that knowledge can be transformed into faculty, taste, power and character only on the condition that it lose its identity.*" Expert testimony again.

And this objection so far as it may be allowed as an argument is rather against the poor teaching of the classics than against the classics themselves. Right here it would be just as well for all of us to be humble. I do not think that the teachers of any one branch or division of knowledge are so free from fault that they can point the finger at the Greek professor and say like the Pharisee, "Lord, I thank thee that I am not as other men are * * or even as this publican." The fact is, that the history of education is the history of a series of experiments, some of them brilliant successes, some dismal failures, and pro-

gress has been made only in this way. That the methods in vogue for many years have to answer for much of the present hostility or aversion to the classics, I am quite sure. But a new day has dawned. New ideas are getting abroad. New aims are being set before the teacher, and new methods have been devised. Classical teachers are beginning to see that even the grand old blind poet of Greece with his charming stories, his wonderful word pictures, or the mighty thunder of Cicero, or the sweet songs of Horace, are tame and uninteresting, dry-as-dust, when used simply as parsing exercises. They realize that there is a humanity throbbing and pulsing through these old authors not unlike that life which beats in our own bosoms. They are seeking for and using all that has been done in art, architecture, the uncovering of buried cities, the opening of long forgotten tombs, the dredging of rivers to make that old life new and real. But where outside of the great universities do you find equipment for this work? There are balances and microscopes, air-pumps and batteries to illustrate science; cyclopedias, dictionaries, poems, orations, histories, books without number for history, literature, and logic; but the classical teacher, with a branch one of the most difficult, is thought to be amply equipped if he has his text-book, a last century dictionary and a school grammar. The history, the art, the genius of these old nations must be studied and when the teacher of Latin and Greek can be furnished with the necessary apparatus at a cost of about one fourth of the sum expended for science or English literature, we may expect a decided increase in the interest, enthusiasm and practical benefits of these studies. The scientific method can be applied to no branch with greater success than to the classics, but for such laboratory work equipment is an absolute necessity and to require or expect such results without it is but a modern case of "bricks without straw."

3. *It is objected that what is gained is impractical knowledge*, that is a knowledge which cannot be put into practical, daily use in the business of life, a knowledge which has no direct equivalent in terms of dollars and cents. Before we discuss this objection please notice how delightfully inconsequent the logic.

At first the objection is that they learn no Latin or Greek, or so little that it amounts to the same thing. Then they straightway forget what they have *not* learned. And at last we are met with the statement that what they have *not* learned and yet have forgotten is after all impractical knowledge. And now granting for the sake of the argument that this objection is true, we may reply that very much knowledge is of that sort. We never use it. We did not expect to use it when we spent hours and strength upon it. If you go through any college curriculum and strike out everything but that which is *practical* in the sense in which this word is used, you will have precious little left, and that little by no means presents a justification of the college, the university and the higher schools. This all rests upon a mistaken idea of the mission of the college, and what a college education should do for a man, an idea that thrusts at the college, and the classics as a very vulnerable point in the college work. The object of a college education, as defined by an opponent of the classics, is "to fit a man for the world, for life; to give him knowledge, exactness, thoroughness; to enable him to follow out a line of sustained, close thought, expressing himself in clear, concise terms." To this definition we shall return shortly. According to it, the work of the college is to train men to *think*, to strengthen their mental and moral muscle and fibre, to give them ability to *do* something when they are ready to determine *what* they will do. The special work a man will do being decided, the special school fits him for that work, gives him the technical, professional knowledge necessary. The college does not pretend to teach medicine, or theology, or law, but it is supposed to fit him to enter successfully on these professional studies. I said "*supposed* to fit him" advisedly, because objectors often point triumphantly to notorious failures. We have now to add that education is not a patent process conducted after a fixed formula, but it deals with quantities which are in part unknown and with factors which cannot always be managed. The result expected presupposes two things—*diligence* and *capacity;* and it is well known to all teachers, though not so clear to all parents,

that all students do not possess these two qualities. Some are capable enough but lack in diligence; some are diligent but lack in capacity. When now a college has failed to do what was fondly hoped for and expected, it is possible that it is the fault neither of the subjects taught nor of the methods employed, but comes from the large personal factor in the problem.

Now to recur to the definition just cited, we contend that the study of Latin and Greek really fits a man better than anything he could study in their place for the highest usefulness in this active, bustling, hard-hitting, many-tongued world, full of living issues. *This study is practical*—the very thing which this age worships; and should therefore be cultivated and retained. And I give my reasons for the faith that is in me.

1. *The tools are the most perfect ever put into the hands of man.* Remember what it is that education proposes—"to fit man for the world; to give him the power of sustained, close thought and to express himself in clear and concise terms." A good workman may do good work with poor tools, but it is much better to give him the best. Of these two languages the Greek has by far the most perfect system of grammar among all the tongues of earth. This statement does not mean that necessarily it was the best language, but that the formal element had been reduced to a regular scientific form. This shows a highly developed stage of language. Some of you may think this strange as there rises before the mind's eye the grim specter of the famous irregular verbs, but even these were regular in their irregularity—they came regularly from the word you did not expect. And the language, of course, from which the grammar was drawn was a language wonderful in its flexibility, its power to express every idea which the mind of man could conceive. There is but one language, in my opinion, that approaches it in this respect, and that is the German, but it is heavy and cumbersome beside the grace and capacity of the Greek. How rich the German is in its auxiliaries—its helping verbs! But what the German had to express by these helpers the Greek expressed elegantly and clearly by a mere variation of form.

Add to this language, which philosophy has made her mother

tongue, the language of Rome. It is not so complete or copious in its grammar but how clear, how concise as was befitting the language of law! "The act of composition and the knowledge of its theory went hand in hand. Among Roman classical authors scarce a sentence can be detected which offends against logical accuracy or defies critical analysis."* And what strength! It moves along with the steady tread of her legions. The union of this perfection of form and this perfection of strength provides an instrument for discipline which the world has done well to use for more than four centuries of educational work.

The very process of translating makes these languages fruitful. Translating is simply transferring an idea from one language to another in such a way that as little as possible of the beauty or force of the original may be lost in the process, while at the same time guarding against any accession to the idea. A translation that adds to the beauty or force of the original is not a translation. In much translating both faults are prevalent. Some authors have a beauty that is peculiarly their own or a style so suited to the genius of the language they speak that brought over into any other tongue this personal, native flavor and fragrance is lost. Shakespeare in German is another being; Schiller in English is tame and dull. Luther's "Ein feste Burg" has been the despair of translators for three centuries. The Odes of Horace, by whatsoever hand they may be done, have lost something, while Jowett's Plato is English, beautiful, clear, strong English, but English still, not Greek. And this very task employs the highest faculties of the mind. The student before he can express in terms of English must first clearly grasp the idea which his Latin or Greek author intends to convey. This is sometimes hard to do even in English. To lay hold of these ideas requires attention, a concentration of the mind upon the thing to be done. Even with this the task is but half done. There remains the clothing of the idea with new words—to fit to it other words which shall be so well chosen that the picture in your mind passes over to the mind of others unchanged. Here with every change and every phrase there

*Crutwell's Hist. Lat. Lit., p. 2.

comes into play the judgment and the exercise of taste. Words and their meanings must be carefully discriminated that the best and fittest expression of the idea be chosen. Wide differences hang upon the meaning of some particle or the shading which a preposition may give. And is not this *practical knowledge?* Is it not a training which leads to practical results? What is it that the lawyer needs, that the physician must have, that the practical business man must possess, if they are to succeed? Is it not *accuracy?* And will not the training which makes a man able to estimate the force of a Greek particle or a Latin preposition give him power of mind to interpret a law, diagnose a case, or write and understand a contract? How many laws are inoperative which are just and equable in their provisions and ought to be executed, but were drawn by men who did not know the meaning of words or understand the laws of language! How many contracts are violated by men who have small sense of honor, because the contract was faultily worded! And our courts are full of cases which could have been prevented by accuracy of thought and expression.

2. *The classical languages are practical just because they are what men who deal in cheap ridicule call "dead languages."*

While we are at it, we might as well say that the honors are about even on that score. I doubt much if a Greek root is much deader than a trilobite, or a mollusk or a mastodon's tooth; at any rate it is modern as compared with them in point of age, if we are to believe the half that science so confidently asserts. But they are valuable as agents for discipline just because they are *dead* languages. Their form is fixed. What they are today they have been for centuries, and will continue to be. The meanings of words do not change. When once you have grasped them you have something. Every new word is an acquisition, an addition to your capital. The modern languages, English French and German, are all living languages. They are passing through their various stages of development and have not reached that stage where their forms are crystallized into the shape which they shall wear. For purposes of discipline it is one of the essentials that the thing with which we deal shall be

constant—that when employed it shall reach the same result again and again, and that what is employed as true to-day shall not be something else to-morrow. Consequently mathematics has always been used for discipline. Centuries ago Plato wrote over his school, "Let no man enter here without geometry." Two and two make four to-day and forever. When you have learned that the shortest line between two points is a straight line you have gained a principle which is true to the end of time. You will never have to revise or reverse your conclusion. And very much in the same way, though not to so great a degree possibly, the classic languages are valuable for discipline. Your rule deduced from examples to-day holds good to-morrow. But the *science* of yesterday, to-day is discredited; and everything indicates that our science will last but to-day and to-morrow it will be something new. And this uncertainty preëminently disqualifies the sciences as factors of *educational* value. They may develop observation, but so does Greek; they may teach you the process of induction but so do the languages.

And the languages which are put forward as substitutes—what of them? When you come to make the comparison, let it be remembered that the use and study of the classics is not a late "fad" or fancy, but that they have been tested by quite four hundred years of actual use, and that in this length of time they have been profoundly studied, their results have been analyzed and their value established beyond dispute. And while the classics are old and tried, the substitutes proposed are comparatively new and untried. The study of English both from the standpoint of national pride in the tongue of our own race and country, and its practical value and interest, is not to be underrated. I would by no means be understood as depreciating the study of English, but it has been taught in our schools too short a time to dogmatize on its value as an *educational* branch. When it has been taught for a century and its results are known and a basis broad enough from which to generalize has been gained, when it has produced a generation of scholars and writers who write English and not doggerel and dialect, it will be time enough to settle the question of its claims. There is no nobler

page in the history of the human mind than that which records the glories of English literature, but you will remember that what is *literature* in English is the product in a very large degree of classical culture and of the influence of classicism upon education. John Stuart Mill was a man with but little of the antiquarian in his mental "make-up," a man with but little reverence for the past because it was past, and one whose literary judgments were unbiased in an unusual degree. He says: "Even as mere languages no modern European language is so valuable a discipline to the intellect as those of Greece and Rome, on account of their very regular and complicated structure. In these qualities (the qualities which make a language valuable for study) the classic languages have an incomparable superiority over every modern tongue." Hear another piece of testimony. George P. Marsh says: "So far from dissuading from the study of Greek as a branch of a general education I do but echo the universal opinion of all persons competent to pronounce on the subject in expressing my own opinion that the language and literature of ancient Greece constitute the most efficient instrument of mental training ever enjoyed by man, and that a familiarity with that wonderful speech, its poetry, its eloquence, its philosophy and the history it embalms, is incomparably the most valuable of intellectual possessions."* And the great Tayler Lewis, one of the brightest lights of American scholarship, one of our nation's greatest teachers, said: "It is my deliberate judgment from the observation of a lifetime that if you want a man to master science let him study Latin three years and science one year and he will know more science at the end than if he had studied science four years without the Latin."†

3. *I hold these studies to be practical also because of the dependence of our language and literature upon these two languages.*

Archbishop Trench estimates the Latin and Greek words in the English at thirty-five per cent. of the whole vocabulary. Prof. Hadley in his essay on the English language in Webster's International Dictionary says that the words of foreign orgin in

*Lect. on Eng. Lang., p. 95.

†Quoted by Dr. King, Regents Rep. Univ. of N. Y., 1894, p. 854.

the English are a decided majority of the whole number. Of these imported words, which certainly are not less than sixty per cent. of the whole, all but about five per cent. are from the Greek and Latin, in which is included also the number from the French as a descendant of the Latin. And Meiklejohn in a text-book on "The English Language" says: "The majority of words in the English tongue are not English. In fact, if we take the Latin language by itself there are in our language more Latin words than English."* Here I am reminded that this same author states that by far the larger part of the words in actual daily use are Anglo-Saxon in their origin rather than classical; and while I grant this is true, you will find that the numerical majority comes largely from the small words, the articles, particles, prepositions, conjunctions and the like, which are of very frequent occurrence. These connectives are neccessary to the frame-work of the language but no one would assert that they constitute the language any more than coupling pins and links make a train of cars. The important thing is the word that is big with meaning, the word that constitutes the pivot of the sentence, and that word more often than not is a word whose form proclaims unmistakably its foreign origin.

And when we come to literature the case is even stronger. The author just quoted says: "We may say without any sense of unfairness or any feeling of exaggeration that until the Latin element was thoroughly mixed, united with and transfused into the original English the writings of Shakespeare were impossible, the poetry of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries could not have come into existence. This is true of Shakespeare; and it is still more true of Milton. His most powerful poetical thoughts are written in lines the most telling words of which are almost always Latin."† He might have added that one of the elements of Milton's strength lies in the fact that his order of words is almost regularly the inverted order which we find in Latin and which is so constantly, but so unjustly berated. In close harmony with what has already been quoted we have a

*The Eng. Lang., p. 281. †The Eng. Lang., p. 287.

couple more to add. One from Geo. P. Marsh, who says: "No one would think it possible to compose an epic, a tragedy, a metaphysical or critical discussion wholly in Anglo-Saxon."* The Chief Justice of England in an article in *The Youth's Companion*, counseled young lawyers to study carefully the "Corpus Juris"—the body of the Roman civil law. He says: "A great body of our law finds its source in the Roman law; and in the *Corpus Juris* that law is presented, systematized in a way for which our English law has no parallel."† In his mind Latin seems to be both practical and profitable from the legal point of view.

If we go still deeper we find that even our boasted civilization has its roots far back in these two nations and the ideas for which they stood, and that these national ideas and ideals modified by the presence and power of Christianity have made the world what it is. Look back into the Latin and see what words it gives us expressive of moral character—such words as *honesty*, *honor*, *self-restraint*, *probity*, *patriotism*, and with the words have shown us the thing itself in the Roman character. The Greek has opened to our eyes visions of science, art, architecture and literature; it invented all the potent literary forms, the epic, lyric, dramatic, pastoral, and not only invented but lifted up these forms to perfection. It has given us our language for science and philosophy. It might be too bold to say that we could have no science or philosophy without Greek, but as a matter of fact we have none that does not show in its very vocabulary the influence of that matchless tongue. Even our literary men, some of whom have caught the infection of the age, owe all that in them is worth preserving or worthy study to the influence of these two old world languages; and our literature is what it is, and our civilization, through these *dead* but speaking languages.

4. I add one other reason—*the intrinsic value of the literature itself.*

The literature of Greece and Rome is unrivaled. Such has

*Lect. on Origin and Hist. Eng. Lang., p. 57.

† *Youth's Companion*, Feb. 13, 1896.

been the verdict of the ages, which cannot be set aside by bold assertions. To decry Homer, to belittle Demosthenes, to underrate the eloquence that thrilled Rome, to discount the sweet music of Horace or the grace and beauty of Vergil is but to give public exhibition of conceit and to proclaim one's ignorance. Time has pronounced upon their merits, and their laurels are secure. It is the most original, the most artistic, the most varied, the most stimulating product of human genius. "Their line has gone out through all the earth." All modern civilization feels their impulse. All modern literature holds them as its standard of perfection and struggles to reach their matchless perfection. Call the muster roll of the ancients! Who has surpassed in epic that blind poet, Homer, so far back toward the beginning that his name and history is only less mythical than the story he writes! Who has ever thought more profoundly or come nearer the solution of the problems of life and destiny than the proto-martyr of philosophy, Socrates, and his pupil Plato! Who has rendered a greater service to formal science than Aristotle! What dramatist has ever surpassed in power and human interest the Greek triad, Æschylus, Sophocles and Euripides! What tongue has ever wielded language more persuasively or with greater power than he who stands easily first in oratory! And it is no mere coincidence that the age which produced these great minds and the land in which they flourished was also the land of Phidias and Polycletus and Scopas, the home of the Parthenon, the Phidian Jove, the Hermes of Praxiteles and the temples of the gods. Nor was it a mere happening that the fulness of God's time came when this world-language, this universal tongue developed and enriched beyond any other tongue by centuries of profoundest thinking, was everywhere prevalent. It was a tongue fit and capable to proclaim the new and startling thought of salvation by faith to the nations of mankind. To every Christian it must always be sacred as having embalmed in its imperishable forms God's latest word to man; and no scholar will ever be satisfied with his at-

tainments until he has sought in that distant past the seed which has blossomed into the harvest of the present.

And if that literary canon be true that what impresses us in any production is the *form*, the shape which it takes under the master's hand, then may the world still go to school to the ancients. The masters who have taught the world are there.

"On the heights of this literature, those who are worn with the troubles or disturbed by the mental maladies of modern civilization can breathe an atmosphere which, like that of Greece herself, has the freshness of the mountains and the sea." "Humanity cannot afford to lose out of its inheritance any part of the best work which has been done for it in the past. All that is most beautiful and most instructive in those achievements is our permanent possession; one which can be enjoyed without detriment to those other studies which modern life demands; one which no lapse of time can make obsolete and no multiplication of modern interests can render superfluous."

ARTICLE IV.

THE LINE OF CLEAVAGE.

ESSENTIAL DOGMATIC DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE LIBERAL AND POSITIVE SCHOOLS OF THEOLOGY.

By Rev. George U. Wenner, D. D.

The conviction that we are living in a critical period, or at least are approaching a crisis in religion and in the history of the Church is shared by all. But as to the significance of this crisis, there is a difference of opinion. To some it is a sign of Antichrist and of impending judgment. To others it is the dawn of the coming kingdom. Whatever view we take of it, it is important that we should at least have some knowledge of the movements themselves, and be able to locate them and define their relation to one another.

The task is made difficult by the necessity of considering intellectual causes that lie far beyond our times and that have had a potent influence in determining present conditions. There are

causes in mind as well as in matter. It is true, man has freedom, and hence intellectual development is not of the same kind as physical development. It is also true that there are spiritual forces which no man can explain, which again and again have swept away ancient systems and brought about a new creation in the hearts of men and in the life of the Church. But ordinarily we are subject to the logic of intellectual facts as truly as to the law of gravitation.

The theological period in which we live is generally conceded to date from Schleiermacher. He died in 1834. His epochal work, Die Glaubenslehre, was published in 1821. This remarkable period therefore, still an unfinished chapter in the history of the Church, began within the memory of men who are still living. Schleiermacher owes his unique position not so much to his transcendent ability, as to the genial manner in which he absorbed the results of the religious thought of preceding generations, cleared the table of useless rubbish, and prepared the docket for the new period which he ushered in. The items, if we may so speak, of the theological estate which he was called upon to administer, were the general results of the Reformation, the dogmatic theology of the seventeenth century, the pietism and the rationalism of the eighteenth century, and the philosophical systems of Kant and Hegel.

To characterize Schleiermacher's system in briefest form is to say that he places the home of religion in the heart. Christian consciousness has and expresses religious truth without regard to the question whether science leads to it or not. Intellect and feeling are forever together and yet forever separate. Like the two poles of the galvanic battery, they are necessary to each other but can never meet or supplant each other.

While his place in the theological world is unique, his place in the religious world is not so easily determined. All parties claim him and, with few exceptions, all parties have derived from him impulses which are felt to this day in most widely differing schools of thought.

We cannot understand the period without a brief outline of its philosophical tendencies, so far as they relate to theology.

According to Zoeckler, there are three main currents, the speculative, the radical, and the critico-rationalistic. The first class are Hegelian idealists. In the person of Christ they distinguish between the ideal and the historic Christ, the Christ of faith and the Jesus of history. Their great leader was Baur, and Holtzmann and Hausrath are among his followers. The radicals were led by Strauss, and include Feuerbach, Bruno Baur, the Darwinistic evolutionists, the advocates of monism. Opposed to these evidently anti-Christian extremes stand the critico-rationalists, whose object, while preserving the fundamental ideas of Christianity, is to discover its substance by a historico-critical method and thus to mediate between philosophy and religion. The chief names that meet us here are Weisse, the younger Fichte, Otto Pfleiderer, Biedermann, and the neo-Kantian Lipsius of Jena.

For the religious classification of the period we may use the terms right wing, left wing and extreme left. To the right wing belong the orthodox Lutherans of Hengstenberg and the Erlangen and Leipzig schools. Also the moderate Lutherans, such as Neander, Tholuck and Beck. Also the Reformed, such as Hagenbach, Pressense, Godet, Schaff. To the left wing belong the writers in the Jena Year-books, Baur's school, Kuenen, Stanley, Seeley. To the extreme left belong Ritschl and his school. As his place has in theology not yet been absolutely defined, a few words of characterization are necessary. He has cut loose from all philosophy. Metaphysical statements of our faith rest on a use of reason that transcends its proper boundaries, and hence are not justified. On the other hand, he points to Jesus Christ as a real historical personality, a divine revelation, not merely a religious idea. This revelation in Christ is for him the only dogmatic foundation of knowledge. The believer has here a firmer foundation than all speculation can give. Against the method of his system, it is objected that he inserts into the documents ideas that cannot be deduced by unprejudiced exegesis. As to its substance, the mystic element is not sufficiently recognized, because of his fear of bringing in metaphysical ideas. In the high-priestly office of Christ he has pelagian views. He de-

nies that Christ was punished for us. Hence it is doubtful whether he has an adequate view of sin. Nor does he teach a real conferring of salvation, but only a change in our consciousness. Not so much our relation to God is changed, as our knowledge and opinion of that relation. A few years ago the Ritschlian movement threatened to carry everything before it in Germany. It is a factor that we shall have to reckon with in America before long.

This introduction was tedious but it was necessary. It affords the elevation from which we may look down on the surging sea of theological opinions whose dogmatic differences it is my purpose to define.

In doing so, I disclaim all pretense of originality. I have simply collated the facts as best I could from the guide books I had at hand and present the result of my examination. For the history of the eighteenth century, I have used Kahnis' Inner Course. For the nineteenth century, Frank's Geschichte und Kritik. Also Zoeckler's Handbook, and especially the Unterschied of Robert Kübel, late Professor in Tübingen. Life is too short to read all the books that are published in Germany, to say nothing of the English and American reprints. Luther's catechism I still find a safe and competent guide in the mazes of dogmatic strife.

The first general division that occurs to us is the distinction between those who hold tenaciously to the traditional doctrines of the Church and the Bible, and those who vary from them to a greater or less degree. We may call them the conservatives and the liberals. But in the first class there are degrees of conservatism. There are those who adhere so closely to the old views that they will not admit even changes in terminology. Others believe as firmly in the old truths but are willing to restate them in modern language. So also among the liberals there are radicals who answer with Strauss to his own question. "Are we Christians still?" with an emphatic "No." But the great majority are simply desirous of putting new wine into new bottles, and are not averse to mixing a little of the old wine with the new. Some of them have been suspected of placing old

labels on the new bottles. For our purpose we may safely eliminate the two extreme classes. The radicals have practically no existence in modern theological thought. And the ultra conservatives are of too little importance to demand serious consideration. We therefore have to deal only with two opposing trends which are usually known as the positive and the liberal schools of thought.

In Christianity there are two factors, the divine and the human. The relation which men's minds take to these two factors determines the development of Christian thought. It is a healthful scientific development when the one is not ignored, no matter how much the other may predominate. The conflict of ideas wages between these two. Now it must be conceded that the theology of the Church is mainly controlled by the divine factor. Christ is essentially divine, and the life that he brings is essentially that which will be realized in its fulness only in the world to come. In the theology of the Church, the Scriptures, which tell us about Christ, are essentially God's word, inspired in a peculiar manner by the Spirit of God. Hence the active determining force in the theology of the Church is an objective, divine authority. The human factor is not ignored, but it is essentially passive. The danger here is that from the religious point of view the moral will be entirely lost sight of. Wrapped up in the contemplation of heaven, men will have no time to think of this world and the responsibilities of this life. Thereupon, against the teachings of the Church, or at least against the so-called dogmas of some of its representatives, there springs up a reaction. But this reaction may itself readily become extreme. Putting aside objective divine authority, it appeals to the authority which it finds in man's own inner life. Reason is made the final arbiter in matters of faith, and we have rationalism. Or the will, and we have moralism. Or feeling, and we have fanaticism.

Now the traditional view of the Church is the one which the positive school maintains, and in doing so, it places the emphasis on the divine factor in Christianity. Over against this view there presents itself, not indeed for the first time, for we have

had heretics in all ages, but with an intensity which has never before been equaled, an energetic attempt to revise or at least to modify the traditional standpoint, and in doing so, the emphasis is placed on the human factor in Christianity. The adherents of this school are called liberals.

But while we hope to present distinctly the line of cleavage between these two schools of thought, we disclaim all personalities. For this reason, men's ethical views may hold them in one school while their dogmatical views place them in another. The boundary lines are not straight, but serrated, or rather like the shore line of a continent. Besides, the heart and the mind do not always agree. We shall not unchurch ministers because of their views in scientific theology. Whether they should be admitted to the pulpit, is a question for their own churches to decide. A touching illustration of this non-agreement of heart and mind is found in the life of Biedermann, one of the leading representatives of the critico-rationalistic school. In his old age he wrote to Professor Frank, with whom he had previously had no correspondence. He said he would rather associate with men of views opposed to his own than with the men of his own school. Referring to an article which Frank had written, in which he had criticised Biedermann and had said to all of his school, "Keep your hands off of Christ. For you he is incommensurable. He does not fit into your categories." He said: "No indeed, neither my heart nor my hand will I take away from him, and that too in precisely the sense in which you would forbid me." In his last illness he occupied himself with words of Scripture and was consoled by the hymns of Gerhardt. A friend wrote to him and referring to the Saviour's reply to the dying thief, who had asked only to be remembered by him in his kingdom but had received the promise of an infinitely greater blessing, said: "With the thief on the cross, you too know what sin is. May the Redeemer from sin and death be very near to you." He replied that the letter had caused him the deepest joy and was an echo of his own thought. The friend who reported the incident, said, "his heart was superior to his system."

An exhaustive discussion would take us through the entire course of what is known to old-fashioned people as systematic theology. But my time will permit me to touch but briefly on two subjects, the Scriptures and the Person of Christ.

On the subject of the Holy Scriptures, while the contest has been exceedingly hot in Germany, there have been in some respects fewer difficulties there than elsewhere. The Lutheran Church is not committed to any theory of inspiration. Nothing was clearer to Luther than that the Scriptures were the word of God. Every word, every letter, he says in one place, outweighs all the treasures of earth. On the other hand he freely criticizes books which in his opinion are lacking in gospel quality. Thus the Epistle of James he thinks has a great deal of straw in it. The Gospel was the touchstone which he applied to the books, by which he measured their quality. The same spirit permeated all the official utterances of the Church.

The dogmaticians of the seventeenth century, it is true, drew up some finely spun theories of inspiration which included even the vowel points of the Hebrew text, but these were theories only and never composed any part of the Church's confession. For this reason, the Christian thought of Germany has been less hampered by artificial restrictions than some other churches of which we have heard. Some eminent positive theologians of our day have made large concessions, for example to the critical school of Baur, without in any respect surrendering an essential position.

On the other hand, with the exception of a few radicals, the liberals are at one with the positives on the question whether the Scriptures are indispensable to Christianity. Both Pfleiderer and Lipsius in their way concede this, and so also does Ritschl. The cleavage takes place when we consider the *what* the *how* and the *why*. Even as to the what, there is to some extent consensus. Many leading liberals have conceded that if a doctrinal system is to be obtained from the Scriptures, it will agree substantially with that of the Melanchthonian Lutheran Church. Rothe did not believe in dogmatics, but nevertheless he said he could cheerfully subscribe to the system of Nitzsch. And Nitzsch *is* positive.

The liberal dissents from the positive, first, in respect to the authority of Scripture. Authority is established not by objective character alone, nor by subjective experience alone. There is authority when we bow to a superior power and accept its sway, whether we have experienced the beneficence of its laws or not. Have the Scriptures such authority or have they not? The positive says yes. The liberal says no, or if he says yes, it is with such reservation that it is equivalent to no. He admits its authority in so far as it may express the mind or the spirit of the congregation, that is I suppose of the enlightened Christian consciousness. But the Scripture is not a doctrine in the strict sense of the word, something that is taught and that it is our duty to learn, in other words objective truth. The Scripture contains the ideas, the conception, the popular impressions of the times in which they were composed, are important as historical documents. They reflect the ideas of their time. They are valuable only in so far as they succeed in presenting from out their husk that kernel of truth which we in our inner consciousness recognize as religious truth. Says Lipsius: "It is no directly divine doctrine, but it is a word of God, clothed in fallible human diction." Such a view enables us to sit in judgment on what we regard the fallible conceptions of the biblical writers, and to put them aside as not binding whenever we see fit to do so. Every page of Biedermann, Pfleiderer, Lipsius and the men of that class shows that when they are speaking of Paradise, angels, devils, miracles, certain phases of the atonement even, and especially of eschatology, they are dealing with what in their view are legends, myths, conceptions of the times and various forms of popular superstition. As for Ritschl,* he treats St. Paul as though the latter were a freshman in college about to be conditioned for imperfect recitations. What his followers† of the left wing say it is unnecesary to quote.

Among the positives there is without doubt a wide range of

*Cf. Rechtf. II. (1st ed.) p. 313 ff., 248 ff.; III., 415 ff., 303 ff., 316 ff.

†Gottschich, Bedentung der histor. Krit. Schriftforschung, 1892. H. Schultz, Gottheit Christi, § 419 f.

opinion. Some of them tread dangerously near the liberal lines, nevertheless the distinctive mark, the line of cleavage is that they recognize the Scriptures as objective divine authority. Gess is still as positive when he says, "The Bible is not God's word, but God's word is copiously present in the Bible. The liberal Haupt finds out by experience that the Bible is God's word, and therefore he says for me it is God's word. There are positives also who appeal to experience, but not to that of the individual, but to that of the whole Church. Luthardt and Thomasius speak of the universal experience which the Church in all ages has made of the truth of Scripture. Luthardt says: "The Scripture is norm for the Church and contains the saving word of God for the individual." Kaehler shows that the Scripture is not simply the word concerning Christ and him crucified, but that it is the sum total of revelation. Its authority rests upon the experience of its efficacy as a means of grace.

There certainly must be something which the Bible teaches in answer to the chief questions of religion, especially something that Jesus and his Apostles taught, and this Didache must be something clothed with objective authority, which we cannot ignore, but which, if we are Christians, we are bound to believe and to accept as final truth. It is not necessary here to define what that truth is, but it is sufficient to have indicated that the positives recognize this infallible authority and that the liberals do not.

A second topic which we ought to consider is the literary character of the Bible, or the Bible in its human origin. And the third topic is the question of inspiration, or the Bible in its divine origin, both of them questions of intense interest. But my limits will not allow me even to touch upon them. But enough has been said to indicate the direction which the line of cleavage would necessarily take. I hasten therefore to the second general subject which I proposed to illustrate, the Person of Christ.

What think ye of Christ? This is the fundamental question in the Christian catechism. All schools, even the liberals, recognize Jesus as the Son of God. But what do the liberals

mean when they use this term? Hermann says: "The term divinity of Christ does not trouble us." Ritschl loves to speak of the "predicate" or "title", "divinity of Christ." Kaftan's idea of the divinity of Christ is that Jesus is "the man in whom God permits the fulness of his eternal being to abide so that he becomes for us the image of the invisible God." Lipsius thinks there is no material difference between those who debate over the signification of the expression "divinity of Christ," since we all believe in the divinity in Christ." And Ziegler says that he is in perfect accord with sincere orthodoxy so far as the relation of his heart to Christ is concerned.

The positive school declines to accept these honeyed words as a basis of brotherhood. Behind them all is the conviction that Christ is man. We believe that Christ is God.

Biedermann says: "The essential content of the dogma of the God-man is not found in the determination of the unique person of Jesus, but in the new idea which made its appearance in humanity for the first time in the person of Jesus, that of our filial relation to God." It is the Christian principle to which we owe our redemption, which he defines as "the self-consciousness of the finite spirit in regard to the absoluteness of spirit." The first development of this principle faith sees in the personal religious life of Jesus. His life is therefore a guaranty of the efficacy of this principle. The historical Jesus may therefore be regarded as worthy (!) of being considered the historical Redeemer for all times, the fountain of the efficacy of the principle of redemption in history. Lipsius too distinguishes between the religious principle and the historical person of Jesus, although he admits that they are united in him. Pfleiderer loves to use the word spirit instead of principle, but that he also is a worshiper of that unknown philosophical quantity, is evident when he says "Christ is that historical personality in whom and through whom the Holy Spirit of Godsonhood or Godmanhood has become a historical reality. He is the type of the Godmanhood. He is the microcosmic Godman over whom the macrocosmic Godman will tower as an infinitely enlarged copy." From these quotations it is clear that to all these theologians the nature of Christ is purely

human. Of pre-existence or of virgin birth, it is useless to speak. As Lipsius says: "Divinity of Christ means that the consciousness of Godsonhood appeared in him and was disclosed by him to the congregation."

As to the continued existence of the exalted Christ, the question is either more or less ignored by the men I have named, or with Lipsius they declare that we can have only a fantastic conception of its nature. We may love him as we love Luther or any other historical character. Hence we can worship him, according to Pfleiderer, only in the sense of John 14:9: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." It is a churchly custom that ought not to be given up. Prayer to God is to be commended, because in doing so we seek deliverance from the pressure of the evil of this world, and in communion with the divine life we find this deliverance. But in reality it is only a symbolical act. Our prayers are heard, in so far as we have an inner experience of the results of faith. Outwardly it will manifest itself in the world-overcoming power of faith.

Very different is the position of the Ritschlians.* Over against the critico-rationalists whom we have considered, they seem almost to speak the language of Canaan. What makes Christ God is not the principle of Lipsius, but the sum total of the significance of the historical person of Christ. True religion is the supernatural independence of the spirit over against nature and society, and an experimental knowledge of the paternal love of God. This is possible only in the Christian congregation, the founder of which was Christ. In philosophical terms we can only have *Werturteile* in regard to him, which I suppose means, in the language of the Church, that we know nothing about his nature, only about his office. Certain expressions of the master seem to concede the resurrection, and among his followers there seems to be forming a right wing whose views approximate those of orthodoxy. In the inchoate condition of this school it is difficult to form a just judgment. But certainly

*Harnack, Das ap. Glaubensbekenntniss, p. 38. (Ritschl, Rechtf. III. p. 364 ff., 370 ff. Unterricht §13, §19).

among his followers of the left wing,* the supernatural in Christ is nothing more than is peculiar to human nature.

The positive school holds with Luther that only he who is *natura* God can redeem us. The historical Christ was indeed man, but God who had become man. Christ is not only of divine worth, [*Wert*] but of divine being. Thus Dorner shows that Christian consciousness feels the need of connecting the person of Christ with the trinitarian idea of God, and this takes place in the doctrine of the logos. He of course defends the virgin birth. This subject has recently come into the foreground through Harnack's fight against the use of the Apostles' creed in the new liturgy of the Prussian Church. I remark in passing that the new liturgy with the apostolicum was adopted a year ago by the General Synod with, I believe, not one dissenting voice.

This then is the positive standpoint, belief in the divine personality of Christ, that is, personal divine pre-existence. Pre-existence implies post-existence, and the transition is the resurrection. All positives without exception maintain the resurrection as an external historical fact. The only use the liberals have for Christ now is that he is the head of a moral kingdom, that is, he represents the idea of such a kingdom, and his followers owe allegiance to him in the Christian life. He is in fact a new lawgiver, a kind and loving one, it is true, at least he represents that idea, but nevertheless a lawgiver, and the Gospel has to give place to a new code of morality.

With such views of course there can be no personal relation to the ascended One. As for prayer in the sense of petition, in the strict sense of the word, stripped of all phraseology the liberals deny its efficacy. Is it not clear that their religion is different from ours, and that there is a gulf between us which cannot be bridged over.

We believe in Jesus Christ. It was his voice that said to us long ago, Go in peace, thy sins be forgiven thee. And when we err from him to-day, we cry out, O Jesus, have mercy upon us. And him we need continually. Not a principle, not an

*H. Schultz, Gottheit Christi, pp. 334, 352, 378, 451, 476, 511, 495, 564.

idea, not a new morality, not even a world-conquering faith, but we need Jesus. In him we have life, and him we hope to see with clearer vision when we come to die.

Him therefore the Church will continue to worship and to him she will address her sweetest songs:

"Jesus, thou joy of loving hearts!
Thou Fount of life! Thou Light of men,
Thy truth unchanged hath ever stood;
Thou savest those that on the call;
To them that seek thee thou art good,
To them that find thee, all in all."

ARTICLE V..

CHRIST'S GLORIFIED HUMANITY AND THE LORD'S SUPPER.

By Rev. S. L. Keyser, A. M.

To our mind, there has not been a sufficiently well defined attempt made, in recent discussions of the doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Lord's Supper, to give the scriptural and philosophical basis for belief in that doctrine. If we may make so bold, we would humbly suggest that there have been too much dogmatism and mere assertion and too little proof; too much quotation from theologians and too little appeal to God's word, the only infallible rule and standard. Can we not attain to such a view of the glorified humanity of Christ as will be in harmony with God's word and with the laws of right and clear thinking?

If we examine the New Testament carefully, we shall find that Christ promised his disciples that he himself would come to them again after he had been absent for a little while. He said: "I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you;" "If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him;" "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you;" "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." These passages, and many others that

might be quoted, prove that, while Christ promised the gift of the Holy Spirit, he also promised just as clearly and unmistakably that he would himself come again; not at the last day merely, but during the life of the first disciples, for he said, "I will come to you."

Now when did he come? If we read the vivid narrative of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, we shall see. In Acts 2 : 32 and 33, Peter gives the explanation of the wonderful scene that had just been witnessed: "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we are witnesses. Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear." This much is certainly clear in the foregoing passage—that Christ, having ascended to the right hand of God, was glorified, received the Holy Ghost, and came again at Pentecost and poured the Spirit upon the waiting disciples. He did not baptize them with the Spirit from a distance, from the remote heavens, or the right hand of God, but he literally fulfilled his promise to come again and baptize them and abide with them.

That Christ is not made a prisoner, so to speak, at God's right hand in heaven, is evidenced by Paul's experience on his way to Damascus when the light shone round about him and he fell to the earth. The narrative says plainly that the wonderful colloquy that followed took place between the Lord and Saul. "Who art thou, Lord?" cried Saul. Note the answer: "I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest." It is evident that Christ must have been really present, for Paul afterward contended that he had seen the Lord, had seen him as one born out of due time. However mysterious it may seem, Christ was not only able to be with Paul at this time, but could also make himself visible. How much more, then, must he be able to be present with his disciples in his invisible, glorified form!

The Scriptures clearly teach, therefore, that Christ is present with the believer, and also that the disciples, including Paul, recognized him not as the Logos, but as the Jesus of Nazareth whom they had known before his ascension. Yet the Scriptures

teach just as unmistakably that Christ sits at the right hand of God. For example, Paul says in Rom. 8 : 34 : "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea, rather, is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." Other passages might be cited, as Acts 2 : 33; 7 : 55; Eph. 1 : 20; Col. 3 : 1. How are these representations to be reconciled? There is only one way, and that is by accepting the doctrine of the ubiquity of Christ's glorified humanity. Observe that God is spoken of in the same way in the Scriptures,—in one place as sitting upon his throne in the heavens, and in another place as being present everywhere. The Psalmist said, "Whither shall I flee from thy presence?" As there is a sense in which God's being is centralized, so that he can be thought of and spoken of as sitting upon the throne of the universe, so there is a sense in which Christ is now in his session at God's right hand. But it must also be true that, as there is a sense in which God is omnipresent, so there is a sense in which Christ is present with true believers wherever they are. And this is in perfect accordance with the Christian consciousness. The truly converted person feels that God and Christ are truly present with him, and you cannot convince him that such is not the case; and yet at the same time he feels just as surely that there will come a time when he shall have a clearer, yea, a perfect revelation, when he shall see Christ face to face and know him as he is. Somehow, Christian experience never confuses Christ's personal presence with and in the believer with his session at God's right hand. It is human logic and speculation that are plunged into confusion on that doctrine.

Our conception of the power and nature of Christ's glorified humanity will greatly modify our faith in regard to his real presence in the world in the totality of his being. Before our Lord's ascension his body seemed to be limited by locality, so that when he was in Judea he was not in Galilee; but is he thus limited and bound in his glorified state? If so, wherein is the superiority of his present state over his state when he was here upon earth in fleshly form? Nay, if he is fixed at the right hand of God, he is more helpless to-day than he was in the days of his

humiliation; he might almost be said to be a prisoner at God's right hand. Can we believe that our glorious Redeemer is so powerless?

The Scripture teaches that to be exalted to God's right hand means to be endued with supernal power, not to be bound and handicapped by local limitations. What did Christ himself say of his glorification? John 17 : 5: "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory I had with thee before the world was." Does not this mean that the Christ who had come into history, who took upon himself the form of a servant, was to be clothed with the power and glory of the Logos eternally begotten of the Father? And the Apostle Paul asserts that "in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."

A little reasoning from analogy will help us in these reflections. We ourselves are to have resurrected and glorified bodies, which, we understand, are to be under the complete dominance of our purified yet finite spirits; therefore they will be endued with qualities like those of the spirits that possess and control them, and shall no longer be a prison or a hindrance or a weight of any kind. Now if Christ's body was glorified by the infinite Godhead, would it not be filled with like capacity and power? And so our faith should not stumble at the doctrine of the ubiquity of Christ's glorified humanity, by which—glorious fact! he is able to touch and thrill and redeem all fallen humanity.

Of course our knowledge of glorified substance is extremely meagre. But we have a few data from which to draw inferences. After Christ's resurrection and before his ascension his body was perhaps not fully glorified, but even then it manifested peculiar mysterious powers that it never before displayed. He appeared suddenly and disappeared just as suddenly, and there is no hint of his local and visible presence anywhere during the interims. In one case this strange supernatural power was shown in a marked manner. The disciples were gathered together in a certain room and the doors were shut, and yet Christ suddenly appeared in the midst of them. He either was present with

them all the time in invisible form, and simply made himself visible at the opportune moment, in which case his ubiquity would be proved; or else he came into the room through the wall or the closed doors. If the latter, as William of Occam long ago reasoned, there must have been a moment when his body occupied the same space as a portion of the door or the wall. In this case the fact that a ubiquitous substance may interpenetrate gross material substance would be proved, and therefore that it is not subject to the physicist's law of impenetrability, nor to the limitations of time and place.

Note also that Paul says of the resurrection body, "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body;" and he declares that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven. We must tread reverently here, and must be careful not to transcend the limits of revelation; but would not these citations from Paul indicate that the resurrected and glorified body is so refined, so spirit-permeated, so transfigured that it can no longer be called gross flesh and blood, but partakes of the quality and nature of spirit, though it may not be the same in substance or essence. If this be so, why should we object to the thought of being filled with the glorified humanity of Christ any more than to the thought of being filled with his Spirit? Does not Christ himself say, "I in you, and ye in me?" And was Paul speaking in tropes when he said, "Christ liveth in me?" What does the converted Christian mean when he says, "I have Christ in my heart?" Is he using a figure, which simply means that the Holy Spirit has come into his being? No; he really feels that it is Christ who is in him. He cognizes him as Jesus of Nazareth, the Jesus of the Gospels, who is as real to him as a dear friend whom he may touch with his hand; and he never thinks of him as divided in his nature, partly in his heart and partly at the right hand of God, but as the person called Jesus Christ.

And what is it that makes this experience unspeakably precious, blessedly real? It is the human quality in Christ's nature —that quality that appeals most directly to us, because we are human; that makes Jesus a personal friend and companion to the truly converted Christian. It is Christ's humanity in direct

contact with our humanity. We recognize in him a kindred spirit; one who knows us because he, too, is human; one whom we know because of his sweet sympathy with us. Thus the real presence of Christ in the entirety of his being is a fact of Christian consciousness, and we only lose that glad assurance when, by our unbelief or speculation, we relegate him in the human part of his nature to the remote heavens, and try to content ourselves with the Holy Spirit as his proxy or substitute. Then we sigh in vain for the presence of our Divine-human companion.

Should some one raise the question of the impossibility of Christ's glorified human nature being ubiquitous, we would reply that it is no more mysterious than the doctrine of God's omnipresence. In some mysterious way, too, we know that God's Spirit comes into our hearts. How does he gain such entrance? No one knows. So no one knows how Christ's glorified humanity comes into our being; but our experience proves that he does come in and permeate our whole nature with his gracious presence. Just as spirit is not barred out by the gross material of our flesh, so ubiquitous substance can interpenetrate and transfuse our physical being. If Christ could, before his ascension and complete glorification, pass through closed doors or solid walls, surely he can now press his way into a believer's heart and consciousness.

Perhaps we may now understand the difficult sayings found in the sixth chapter of John, which, however, have no reference to the Lord's Supper, as Luther himself admitted, but which certainly teach a closely related truth. Take the latter part of the 51st verse: "And the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." And the 53d to the 58th. We quote the 54th: "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day;" and the 56th: "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me, and I in him." That our Lord did not mean here a gross or carnal eating of bald flesh and drinking of blood, but a spiritual nutriment, is evident from what he said in the 62nd and 63rd verses: "What and if ye shall see

the Son of Man ascend up where he was before? It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life."

This is simply radiant with glorious meaning, if we can but find the key to the interpretation. What is the meaning? We think it is this: "Verily my earthly flesh profiteth nothing in itself; you cannot eat it; you cannot take it into your being as spiritual nutriment. But what if ye shall one day see me ascend to the right hand of God where my flesh and blood shall be glorified and quickened by the eternal Spirit, for it is the Spirit only that can quicken? Then my glorified flesh and blood shall pervade your being, and I shall dwell in you, and become a living aliment, the heavenly manna, of your life. Then my fulness of spiritual life,—of all true life, indeed—shall be the quickener of your life." Thus the Christ becomes life of our life, and his flesh—that is, his glorified humanity—becomes an aliment indeed and in truth, and it stands true forever and ever that the words of Christ are spirit and life. Let us beware how we keep the Christ himself from us, for it is he who paid our debt upon the cross, and therefore it is he only who can impart to us the merits and living effects of his redeeming grace and power. The Holy Spirit has his own functions to perform, such as conviction and regeneration, but he cannot perform the office of the divine-human Christ, who is the life and manna of the new creation; who alone can give fallen humanity the needed human touch of grace and redemption.

Here was the irreconcilable difference between Luther and Zwingli. The Swiss reformer contended that Christ's humanity was at the right hand of God in the remote heavens and could not be elsewhere; Luther, accepting William of Occam's philosophy of ubiquitous substance, maintained that Christ's glorified human nature, as well as his divine nature, could be everywhere with believers. Zwingli said that Christ's corporeal nature was present only by the contemplation of faith, while Luther declared that Christ in his whole nature was *really* present. We think Luther was right. His was the larger, the nobler, the more Scriptural conception of the person of Christ. Whether

he should have given Zwingli the fraternal hand or not, is quite another question.

But has this doctrine of the matchless person of Christ anything to do with the "real presence" in the Lord's Supper. It certainly has. If Christ in his glorified corporeal nature is present with the believer, he must also be present in the Supper in the same way; nay, he would also be present in the bread and wine. Luther believed that Christ's humanity was immanent in nature, which is also waiting for the redemption of the sons of God; so the Reformer believed that Christ was present in the sacred elements, and when the communicant received them he also received the Saviour. How? No one knows. But who knows how we receive God's Spirit? How does he come through the walls of flesh into the soul? If any man can explain that, we can explain how the spiritual body of Christ is received by the communicant. But is Christ received only in the Eucharist? We should answer negatively. He—the whole Christ—is received whenever and wherever the believer accepts him by a living, appropriating faith.

However, in the Eucharist, when the solemn words, "This is my body," "This is my blood," are said, our attention is especially called to the bodily nature of Christ, which was crucified, dead, buried, rose again, was glorified, and came again to be our personal friend and companion. That part of his mysterious personality which suffered for us, made atonement, paid our ransom—that part is especially set forth as by an object lesson in the sacred emblems, bringing more vividly than under ordinary circumstances to our consciousness the human quality in our adorable Lord. At other times we may think more of his divine nature, of his majesty, his power; in the Holy Supper we think of his human nature, his human love, his human touch. For this reason he said with such pathetic tenderness when he instituted the Supper: "This do in remembrance of me."

Let us pause a moment to reflect upon the language used by our Lord at the institution of the Supper. He said: "This is my body;" "This is my blood." Is this language to be interpreted literally or figuratively? The latter, most assuredly. If

you interpret it literally, you have Popish transubstantiation. If the bread really *is* Christ's body, then it must have been transformed, for it once was bread. No, the bread and the wine are symbols. But, mark, they are symbols, not of the absent Christ, but of the present Christ. Therefore Luther's language is clear and consistent when he says that the Lord's Supper is "the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ."

The expressions, "eating" and "drinking" the body and blood of Christ, are used frequently in our catechisms and confessions. Of course, they are Scriptural terms, for Christ used them again and again in the sixth chapter of John; but we are aware that many people cannot divorce them from the thought of oral manducation. Suppose, however, we substitute such words as communion and appropriation. Christ is a person, and we have personal communion with him of the most intimate kind, and we appropriate him as our Saviour and Friend. Suppose we think, too, of his glorious being as permeating ours, filling us with himself, life of our life and flesh of our flesh. Would not such conceptions lift our minds above everything that is coarse and grating to the most refined feelings and susceptibilities? If our Lord, even before his complete glorification, could pass through closed doors and walls, surely our material bodies would be no bar to his pervading and transfusing our being with himself. Pause for a moment and reflect. Could our Lord really save us and transform us into his own glorious image without coming into direct personal contact with us? Christ immanent —that is the doctrine of full redemption.

We close with a word on the subject of Christian experience. Why is it that so many people are constantly groaning and sighing and praying for Christ to come nearer, just as if there were an aching void in their being? The constantly repeated refrain of their yearning cry is, "Draw me nearer, blessed Lord." Not one unkind word would we say of such earnest, sincere longing. But we would ask in all earnestness, If Christ is in us, and we in him, how can he come nearer? Is not the very phraseology we use an evidence of our skepticism; of our thinking of Christ as far away in the remote heavens, instead of be-

ing really present with us; of our unwillingness to believe that he is here? As long as we hold him off by our rationalism, our doubts or our sins, he will not become a real, living personal Saviour to us. What we need in order to have perfect assurance is not to utter more half-skeptical prayers, not to pray all night for a baptism of power, but simply to *believe* that he is present. "The just shall *live by faith.*" Let us listen to our Lord's incisive and clarion announcement to the centurion: "As thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee;" or that other peerless word: "According to your faith, so be it unto you." The basal principle of the Reformation is justification by faith; and faith is just as essential to a clear, unmistakable assurance of the real presence of Christ.

ARTICLE VI.

THE OBJECTIVE CONSCIENCE.

By Professor M. H. Richards, D. D.

The sesqui-centennial of the College of New Jersey, henceforth to be known as Princeton University, was the occasion of the gathering of men from near and afar eminent in the world of scholarship and letters. The solemnities were marked by the presence of the President of the United States, and graced by his delivery of a public address. During this address he embraced the opportunity of bearing witness to his profound conviction of the supreme importance of the moral character and the religious basis of life as an imperative adjunct of culture and learning; and that which he avowed as his own evidently sincere conclusion was reached and confirmed by the approval and testimony of his audience.

The president is not alone, nor is he the first, in reaching this conclusion. The concurrent voices of many eminent educators and keen observers second and emphasize the verdict that no intellectual excellence, no mere physical training, will suffice for the welfare of a nation or the safety of mankind. The heresy

of "cuteness," is branded as false doctrine; the exaltation of brawn is conceded to be a fatuity as well as a fad; and the pendulum of the best authority after vibrating from the extreme of intellectualism to that of animalism rests, after all its hesitation, at the point of conscience as the true centre.

Observation need not be excessively acute to discern this. Immoral intellectuality always plays the game of life for more points than are in it; and, as an invariable consequence, gets fewer than it could have scored. Immoral animalism is an impossibility for a man, who, because he is a man, must be either moral or immoral, unlike the beast whose physique is all there is of him. Both are splendid incidentals, and enviable acquisitions, but the essential and imperative along with either is the determinative factor of a sound morality whose basis is an intelligent religious conviction as its ruling motive.

Modern society is so highly organized that the domain of an overshadowing intellect is well nigh world wide; and if it be unrestrained by a sense of duty, spurred on only by a selfish greed and ambition, it implies a despotic sway which enslaves mankind to minister to its gratifications. Give it in addition physical force, abounding health and strength, and it fastens its fetters upon a succeeding generation and has time and opportunity to become a dynasty and prolong its sway indefinitely. There was a time when we exalted education, meaning thereby intellectualism, beyond all decency as the one remedy for all evil. That we have added physical force by physical culture has only exaggerated our mistake and its consequent mischief. We have only put more potent weapons into the hands of those ready to wield them against the common welfare; and we have found more ready thus to wield them than for the common good.

Considerations such as these which enforce the moral training of our youth and exalt the domain of character, which consider the direction of effort as more important than its energy and skill, lead inevitably up to the need of study and definition of what this moral sense is, what its proper standard is, whether it falls under the category of that which may be improved by proper training and educated by proper teaching, or not. In a

word, it is the question of the nature of that which is popularly called our "conscience," our consciousness of the moral character of actions. Do we, or do we not, known by our very constitutionality of being what is right and what is wrong? Can conscience be educated, or is it, like our physical breathing, a matter of course? Are we teaching the whole subject with the scientific thoroughness of investigation which its importance demands? Are we educating the conscience adequately, assuming that it can be educated, or are we practically allowing it to grow up as the chance acorn cast fortuitously by a mountain oak?

It would be strange indeed to conclude that the moral sense, unlike that of beauty, of wit and humor, of commodity, of truth, brought with it exact knowledge and instinctive classification. These other senses do not, why should this one? Responsibility for action is the dominating characteristic of man; and any irresistible energy destroys accountability. Even in sense-perception the mechanical operation of the sense organs exacts interpretation; and in that act our judgment is operative, in which operation what the man has voluntarily made himself is no mean factor in his decision. The prior inference from the uniformity of operation which is so conspicuous in our human constitutionality is that conscience, the moral sense, does not embrace inevitably proper classification of what is right and what is wrong, does not invariably detect relation or non-relation to right or wrong, and does not imperatively and irresistibly move the will so that we do what is right and refuse to do what is wrong.

But the conclusion reached from the examination of facts, still more strongly corroborates the inference from man's constitutionality. All the world over, and all time long, man is found to be constituted with this moral sense; and just as firmly as the race is a unit in this, just so clearly it is divergent and contradictory as to its classifications and decisions of the things which are right and the things that are wrong. Even so the will to do right is of higher and lower degrees; and even in the same individual there are readily found contradictions and inconsequent sentiments and irrelevant actions.

The plan of salvation presumes this to be the state of affairs in human nature. It does not originate the moral sense, the existence of which is in the sphere of creation, and not in that of redemption; but it brings to it will-power, and increased intelligence. It does not destroy will-power while enabling it to accomplish action; and it does not present its intelligence in the form of a demonstration. The result is a voluntary merit or demerit, the growth of habit, the culture of the moral sense, both as to sensitiveness and accuracy and in momentum of activity: in the scriptural terms, there is a growth in grace and knowledge, an enrichment in knowledge, an abounding in knowledge, and judgment, an approving of things that are excellent, knowledge of his will in all wisdom, strengthening with all might. All these results are indeed declared to be the fruits of the Spirit, to flow from the grace of God; but yet are just as distinctly recognized as becoming ours by our acceptance, as not being ours because we have exercised the power to refuse or ignore. Were this not so, there would be none of the earnest entreaty to appropriate, assimilate, enjoy all this grace which abounds in the apostolic letters, nothing of the tender and solicitous caution ever present in them which warns us of the perils of disuse and the possibility of losing that which we have.

The whole case stands before us therefore in propositions such as these: our constitutionality includes a moral sense by reason of which we form the concepts of right and wrong, just as we do those of beauty or commodity or truth. These concepts arise upon the occasion of certain sense-perceptions, but they do not classify all our perceptions infallibly, nor classify those of all men alike. In this respect we are educable just as we are as to the beautiful in sight and sound; and a moral art and science and standard are the logical outcome just as they are in painting, sculpture, and music. Finally, we can be trained to a sensitiveness to the moral relation of any state or act far greater than that which is merely spontaneous, as well as to a greater accuracy as to what that relation truly is, and also to habitual conformity of the will and prompt action in accordance with what this judgment has indicated.

The variations found among men in this sphere of psychic activity are readily accounted for when we recognize the threefold possibility thus set before us of varying factors, since they all depend upon what a man makes of himself, and what he accepts and seeks from the environment in which he finds himself. The result, in every case, is what may be justly called a subjective conscience, which means the form and content of an individual man's conscience. Of this sort there are just as many as there are human beings in whom occasion has set the latent moral sense into operation. No two are alike, to the very fraction of a second; and many differ as widely as the average farm house clock from the great regulator of an astronomical observatory.

But, as in the analogous cases of the sense of the beautiful and the right, there must be a standard by which to judge all these varying subjective consciences. If every man can say to every other man, My conscience is as good as yours; my judgment of what is beautiful is as good as yours; my conclusions in reasoning are just as sound and good as yours, then the very end of constituting these senses in man is defeated: they will not end strife as judges; they will not develop and elevate, being devoid of all magisterial authority; they will not conduce to continuous seeking in the same direction, which is the essence of civilization; but they will inevitably disrupt, resist, alienate the entire race. The fact that civilization does exist, that "common sense" can be appealed to, that standards are accepted and have become well nigh axiomatic in all other directions, is the proof that there is a standard conscience which can best be distinguished from the individual's conscience by calling the latter a *subjective* and the former the *objective* conscience.

Let us make sure of being understood! In literature there is a standard by which we judge the literary product of the individual. His standard has been formed by the process of accepting the literary consciousness of some individual, itself assisted and modified in its formation by that of predecessors and contemporaries, and then, little by little, modifying that by the acceptance of changes made in it by others who, from time to time, obtained the approval of the better portion of those who

had cultivated this literary sense. "Authority" is the term by which we denominate such a supremacy. Our appeal is to this authority; and our rhetorics and dictionaries are the registers of what it has decreed. The authority that is present, national, and reputable settles all disputed points. The man whose literary consciousness or product does not conform to this may have his own opinion of himself, but the opinion of all others whose opinion is worth taking, whose opinion will be worth anything in a generation or so, is that he has become faulty, has obscured and vitiated his literary sense: he is in a hopeless minority; and we conclude confidently that the "common sense" of the ever increasing majority against him is practically an unconditioned, absolute deliverance, a standard, the objective literary consciousness of the race.

In reasoning we find the same logical standard, the same fixed rules and laws which must be observed if we are to reach a correct conclusion. Their formulation and enunciation were just such another gradual growth. But long ago that growth reached the stage of a clear consciousness capable of distinct enunciation. They have been stated, they have been tested, they have approved themselves. Every student of logic finds his acceptance of them grow stronger by every test he makes of them; and he would be a bold man indeed who would now attempt insurrection against them. Without laying claims to prophetic insight or foresight, those who have made these laws a "perfect possession" would rest fully assured that if every logical law were suddenly blotted out of recollection, so that the whole process of forming a standard anew had to begin over again, when it was once more completed it would be just what we have now, as surely as that the correct independent addition of the same figures by different pupils would yield the same result.

It is upon this conviction that we base the use of such a term as "objective." We remember that man has a certain constitutionality; we have certitude that the uniform operativeness of it is to be ascertained and defined by collating the largest possible number of instances, or at least a number sufficient to detect variations and defects and to fasten upon essential and generic

qualities and marks. This then, we say to ourselves, is man, what man was constituted, created to be, what man is, in spite of what some men are. More than this, we say also, This is what man ought to be or become; and he who is not thus does not come up to the standard, the objective manhood.

This "objective" is by no means of the same value or kind as a number of "subjectives" viewed as a mere aggregation! The discovery and subsequent certitude as to it are similar to the feeling produced by the special senses: when we find that not only we but others also have the same experience which the words, "I see a chair," indicate, we are certain that it is because such a thing as a chair exists independently of us or of our consciousness of it. And when we discover and acquire certitude as to these "objectives," we pass into the same conviction that they have existence independent of us or our discovery of them. He who believes in an absolute first cause having personality will say: These are the thoughts of God which I am thinking! He who does not believe in such a Being will either turn these "objectives," which are qualities, into things, or stultify himself by efforts not to believe what he really does believe, if judged by his actions instead of by his words.

The "objective conscience" is then God's own moral consciousness, the divine thought and aspect, in so far as man has discovered it out of his created image and likeness, out of his experimental knowledge, out of the contributions of succeeding generations, out of the especial studies of especially devoted inquirers. It has grown up into a standard which in turn is ever modified and yet ever tends to stability among those of highest attainment. It is identified in all this, along with all other standards, with that which we mean by civilization and enlightenment.

It will naturally occur to one at this point that, for the Christian, there is this distinction between the moral standard and all others, the fact that there is a revelation of God's will as to morals, while none has been given us explicitly as to the beautiful, and the like. But we must nevertheless form our own standard even with this transcendent help: we must translate God's word into terms of our own consciousness by living it, or we shall

have no experimental knowledge. No one can be an authority, or aid in building up a standard, without experimental knowledge! Hearsay is no evidence; and mere theoretical knowledge is only hearsay. What we live of God's revelation is all we believe of it. Mankind's objective conscience is not the food from heaven set before it, but only that which it has eaten, digested, assimilated!

There are indeed consequences which flow from this distinction, but they are such as strengthen the importance of recognizing the reality of the objective conscience and the obligations which rest as consequences upon us. The very fact of this revelation as to its nature implies that it has an importance in our well-being far beyond any other element in it. We have been left to ourselves to discover and apply the properties of matter, the elements of beauty, the principles of economics, and the like. We have been aided in this one respect because it is transcendent. Whether we seek an aesthetic culture or not, may be considered a matter of indifferent choice, but we cannot so regard any neglect in the matter of moral culture: a man must be morally cultured. My neighbor may have poor taste and be guilty of bad logic, and yet be a very good sort of neighbor. But if he is deficient in morals he is not a good neighbor: he becomes dangerous to the community and subjects me more or less seriously to loss, injury, discomfort.

Because of this every community has its laws, its formulation of such a part of its moral consciousness as expresses that which a man must do or forbear from doing in order that the community may endure. The growth of these common laws demonstrates the existence and perfecting of the objective conscience. How they differ in communities of undeveloped conscience from those of Christian lands! How markedly the rights of persons increase with a clearer understanding of the dignity and worth of human nature as seen prefigured in Christ Jesus, the objective man! How sharply subjectivism is restrained as its vicious consequences are realized more fully. No individual is left to himself to develop himself or his offspring just as he pleases! Not even the plea that it is his religion, or even his way of re-

garding the religion of the Bible, is accepted if it is so palpably erroneous as to nullify the second table of the Law. Opinions he may hold, matters between his God and himself are left to be settled thus, but in dealings and relations with his fellow-men he must conform to the objective conscience or suffer the penalty their self-defence demands, since this same conscience insists upon such self-defence.

Again, just as a science is completed by a philosophy, so a jurisprudence rests upon a theology and a confession of faith. These are not mere abstractions, ingenious speculations; they stand in living relation to our concrete living. They are constitutions, as it were, the principles upon which laws are based and because of which conduct must be regulated. They are summaries of our belief as to that which is revealed both as to that upon which all are agreed and as to those differences of understanding which depend upon causes far reaching in their causes and their effects. Those who differ thus cannot enter more intimately and intelligently into common worship profitably and habitually: only those who believe sluggishly and indifferently, or with whom worship is a mere emotion, can fail to realize this inability. And as long as public teaching as to the intent and import of God's word is an adjunct of common worship, a distinct confession must mean a separate worship, if it is to be in spirit and in truth.

Having established the fact of the objective conscience, it is comparatively easy to indicate the obligation thus laid upon us, and the essentials in training and education to be inferred from it. First, and not the least in importance, is the cultivation of a proper sensitiveness to the moral relation of our thoughts, words and deeds. Whilst we cannot be unmoral in what we are and do, and are held accountable even for "idle words," undoubtedly very much, far too much, of the life of far too many is lived without any realization of any such relation in it. To express this sort of living the word "unmoral" has been coined, to distinguish from acts knowingly and consciously done in defiance of morality, such acts being strictly denominated "immoral."

This statement is easily verified! Take your own case! Use your powers of observation! The relation of economic commodity is sharply and constantly realized! The question, Will it pay me? is put over and over again every day. So too the relation between an act and the sensuous pain or pleasure of it, determines a hundred cases daily. Some are quick to see the professional relations, such as the literary quality, the grammatical accuracy, the aesthetic harmonies, according to their respective callings. Others are jealous and suspicious as to political or ecclesiastical bearings, and ready to scent offence where none is intended. But in the whole world of men and women how hard it is to call attention or secure reflection upon the moral relation of anything which is not most palpable and patent.

Training must begin early and be continuous to result in such a "tender conscience," such a "godly principle within" which will challenge each act of the will before it allows it to take place. Schooling must have as much stress laid upon this part of an education as upon the intellectual and the physical sides of it. Our youth must be made to think of the right and wrong of things as well as upon their effects on the body, on wealth-producing power, on social standing, and the like. Advantage must be taken of the well known working of the law of association. Constant repetition must reinforce and multiply associations until the training results at least in this, that the habit of considering the right or wrong of actions is as well grounded as the habit of using the correct grammatical forms, the right pronunciation of words, the proper letters in spelling. The importance of conscientiousness justifies a demand that it be developed at least as much, and with as fine a pedagogic treatment, as intellectuality or animalism.

The second aspect of the case is the decision of reason as to what is right, which is not attained simply because we may desire to do the right. All thoughtful persons have realized again and again the difficulty of reaching a decision in certain instances. It is only your emotional, gushing nature, your wildly enthusiastic "reformer," your fanatical religionist, who has no difficulties upon this point! "Cutting the Gordion knot" is not

untying it! The problem is not to separate the yoke from the pole of the chariot by destroying some part of the harness! Alexander did not conquer the world, any more than a whirlwind cultivates a field!

We have treatises on ethics consequently, and articles arguing as to the proper decisions in mooted questions, and differences of view among the very best and noblest of men. Just so we have these disputed points in all the analogous arts and sciences, in theology and philosophy. But also just so the body of agreement, the solid ground, is vastly greater than this uncertain area. To make sure of a right product there must be study and information, consultation of authority, respect for authority, appreciation of the fact that there is an objective conscience and that its contents are attainable, to be had by searching the words and deeds of the greatly good and the godly great. Properly written biographies, presenting ethics in concrete forms, are most helpful for the young in giving just such information.

What shall we say of those who for the sake of brilliancy, of originality, of becoming popular by their outrageousness, "medicate" a work of fiction with false statement, disingenuous chicanery, bad morals and illogical conclusions? They poison the community to gratify a selfish thirst for fame, or a greedy lust for wealth! Few professions are more responsible than those of author and publisher; and yet how often both are abused, how often neither seems to realize the moral responsibility bound up in the dissemination of that which is false or immoral or both.

Public education is an offender also in this direction. What shall we think of such a teaching of physiology and psychology as leaves the high school or academy lad persuaded that the brain is the soul, that diet and environment are character, and that right and wrong mean simply the effects of food and drink upon the tissues? Yet there is such education; and there are such text books; and there are those teaching them whose own sensitiveness and judgment are insufficient to enable them to know what they are doing.

Those who reduce religion to a mere emotion and attempt to

propagate it by a tidal wave, are not without responsibility as to this. Nor are those guiltless who have reduced the sermon, from the dignity of a charge by a judge learned in the law to a jury competent to decide as to the facts, into a recreational lecture to an "audience." However heartfelt or hearty worship is, teaching is still "profitable," the proper preaching of the word. Where that fails, there the reflective temperament will fail, and blind impulse will sway and impel without guiding and without attainment. A man who is unwilling to take the proper pains to know what is right, cannot lay just claims to being conscientious because he does what he thinks spontaneously to be right. A man who disdains to inquire what holy and just men have settled upon as being right, who prefers his own hasty individualistic and subjective opinion to the weight of such authority, has prejudices rather than a conscience. He is the sort of man quite likely to insist that "they done it" is better English than "they did it," or that one form is just as good as the other and that it is a mark of illiberality and narrow mindedness to affirm positively that one form is right and the other wrong.

But what then becomes of the "right of private judgment?" Let us put that question into the form of the *duty* of private judgment, and then discuss it! We must obey the dictates of our own conscience, in any final analysis. Of course we must! To obey mechanically the conscience of another man is not a conscientious act at all on our part! But does not this very thing declare how responsible we are, not only to our own conscience, but for it much more? Shall our life debauch our moral sense, and then the grossness of that sense excuse our immorality? That were the same as deliberately or recklessly drugging ourselves to excite us to kill one whom we should not dare to murder otherwise!

The remedy for the abuse of private judgment is not to be sought by forbidding it, but by educating it. It is constitutional with man to judge, and to judge as to morals or doctrine: you cannot prevent him from thinking by forbidding it. Rome begot, nursed, bred up the very men herself whom she calls heretics. It was as much the fault of her system of repression as

the inevitable of individuality. After all, some one must judge as an authority for others; and who is to vouch for that "private judgment!" It is notorious that the secure unquestioned possession of a right always tends to make men careless of their duty in the exercise of it. Authority needs challenges or it grows lazy, selfish, pleads the great right that will follow for the little wrong done to accomplish it, and lands in the sophism that the end justifies the means.

Toleration of those differing with us is a very different matter from that indolence or inertness which proclaims that "there is no difference," that "we are all one." Toleration, mutual respect, appreciation of causes which have made to differ, all imply that there is a difference, often a very serious difference. We gain nothing by trying to shut our eyes to that! We lose in sensitiveness of conscience by making the effort. For ourselves we must come to a decision and know what is right in our own conscience. If others whose lives show equal regard for right come to some different conclusion, we can surely respect while we dare not imitate, and exercise charity where we cannot cooperate.

There remains yet one point to be considered. In order that action may ensue not only must there be knowledge but feeling also. There must be an adequate and operative motive or the will does not command the hand to work or the foot to walk. What is this motive? We fail to find it anywhere for the mass of men outside of the motive of love, the love wherewith God has loved us, the love wherewith he entreats his erring children to return to him, loving as they are loved. There is no stronger motive, none which assimilates as love does. Philosophy may maintain an unstable equilibrium of conscientiousness for a few, but religion alone builds upon sure foundations. The more distinctly religion brings into our consciousness the love of God, the more definitely it sets his holiness before us, not driving us from him in awe of a dreadful majesty but drawing us to him in the desire of assimilation, the more surely shall we seek to know and to do his will; and thus define and obey the objective conscience.

ARTICLE VII.

THE PILLAR OF THE TRUTH,

EXTRACTED FROM THE "DREI BUECHER VON DER KIRCHE" OF PASTOR WILHELM LŒHE,

By Edward T. Horn, D. D.

1. The Church.

I.

The most beautiful landscape, though it be depicted with a magical pencil, and be true to nature, will not satisfy us if there be no human figure in it. Sadness and dread seize a man, when he sees himself forsaken by his kind, even though it be merely in a picture. Sadder is he who looks upon regions in nature which are utterly destitute of humankind. The more beautiful the spot in which we do not find our kind, the more painful is its loneliness. It seems rather a desert than a paradise. The wide earth would be narrower than a prison to one alone and forsaken. From the very beginning man was so made that it was not good for him to be alone.

Alone, a man cannot be blessed. It would be intolerable to look down from the heights of God upon wonderful valleys and lands, without being able to awaken a like feeling in the breast of another by my exclamation of joy. How much less could I look upon eternal blessedness alone, unable to share it with a companion. I am less able to comprehend the promise of eternal life than Adam was to comprehend the threat of eternal death, though there was then nothing of the nature of death in him, while I already enjoy the firstfruits of life. Yet I will say it: Alone, I could not be happy!

David said, "Whom have I in heaven but Thee, and there is none upon earth whom I desire beside Thee." In the world, in the dark valley of the shadow of death, it seems enough to have God. Would it not be enough in heaven, to have God?

It is a rare happiness on earth to be so alone with Christ for an hour that all one's thoughts, all desires, all joys of the soul,

rest undisturbed in Him, and He, and He alone, is present. How many have never found one such hour! Self always dogs us; the distractions of the world never leave us; we cannot get out of ourselves; and so the joy of being alone with God, for which we pray, may always be an unattained goal. If now, after so many struggles to get free from the world, and one's own shadow and thoughts, a soul should gain the victory and through the bitter pains of death should enter into life, and He would appear "Whom not having seen we love; if Christ would hold him to His heart, and let him rejoice in Him forever, would anything be lacking to that one soul? Would he not be completely happy?

Alone with Christ, you cannot be happy. He and His eternal happiness are too much for one soul, that has not near it any of its kind. David says again: "My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God. When shall I come and appear before God?" But in the same Psalm (42) he testifies: "I had gone with the multitude, I went with them to the house of God, with the voice of joy and praise, with a multitude that kept holyday." Here we can see that he did not wish for a lonely happiness, but that he acknowledges a blessed fellowship with others, and for this he longs.

Even though one did wish to be forever alone with God, his wish could not be fulfilled. As the Lord did not make earth for one man, neither did He make heaven for one. Whoever can wish for an eternal separation from all men, in him is not the love that is from God. Bad as we are, a longing after the Lord our God is born in all men. "For Him were we created, and our heart cannot rest, till it rests in Him." But a longing for fellowship with other men is born in us too; and it shows itself most of all when we have found the Lord. Conversion to the Lord makes the selfish social.

There are many fellowships on earth, but only one can satisfy; for every other fellowship is only a misunderstood prophecy and a more or less perfect shadow of that one fellowship intended by God and by Him destined to be perpetual. This one fellowship is *the Church of God, the communion of saints.* The Church is the eternal community and fellowship of elect souls with each

other and with God. In the Church is not only our happiness, but God's praise, God's glory. Blessed is he, who is one of the millions, each of whom has Christ, and with Him heaven and earth!

2.

It is a thought full of joy, a homelike thought, that in my pilgrimage through this dark valley, I am not alone. God witnesses that I go up to the House of God "with a multitude that keep holyday." And my eyes witness to the truth of that which I know out of the mouth of God. I see around me many men, whom I have good reason to consider children of God.

I am heartily glad for this; but, alas, death takes many a soul dear to me. As lights go out, one after another of the galaxy of my friends departs, and seldom does another star come into those dark places.

But they have only disappeared from mine eyes, my brethren have been promoted to higher places in the kingdom of God. What I feel so deeply is only their blessed progress into fair eternity, the certainty that they are happier than I am.

The pilgrims and those at home—those who walk by faith and those who see the King in His beauty are One Fold; and that which divides them is a passing thing: a weary eye that cannot see; a staff that is breaking,—a body that is frailer than a staff.

We are come to Mount Zion (Heb. 12 : 12 ss.). Its summit is crowned by the heavenly Jerusalem. In it the Triumphant Church surrounds God and His Christ, And towards the Mount, up to its summit, to the city that is builded that the tribes of the Lord may go up to it, goes an inconceivable host of men still in the body. Some are already so near to the summit and the gates of the city that the dawn of eternity shines upon them; while others are still at the foot of the mountain, deep in the gloom of earth, and have no ray of eternity on their brows. Still, all of them belong to the city on the Mount. It is to the living the apostle cries, YE ARE COME TO MOUNT ZION! The goal of the pilgrim Church is THERE. Here she is hastening away; There is her resting-place.

When I was young, I refused many a friendship and fellowship, because it could not last, and I thirsted for a lasting fellowship. Now I know an eternal fellowship, which becomes closer with every day. From it death shall not divide me, but death shall only bring me to full enjoyment of it. To it everything helps me—and nothing hinders me, be it what it may.

3.

The Church which lasts forever, must exist in all ages. In all ages a holy assembly separates from the generations of the world, and is gathered into the indestructible Church of God. For the sake of this separation and this gathering, God bears with the world, and nothing more important, nothing more weighty with results, takes place in all the history of the world. Were it to cease, there would be no more use for the world.

The Church, sprung into life on Pentecost, on Golgotha, goes through all the ages like one stream—and will go on until on that great day it pours itself into the sea of eternal blessedness. And just as all the drops of one stream are of one sort, so all the children of the great stream called the Church, have been of one kind, and ever will be. I am a brother of the Fathers before me, and of the children that shall come. There is no difference between the first and last-born child of the Church, except the difference of *Time*, which passes away.

New and *false* in this matter were the same thing. But the Church is not new. Like a wonderful tree it spreads; out of one shoot always comes the stem of a new shoot. At different periods, different blooms of one flower—such are the various forms of the One True Church, in the course of time.

The Church will not die so long as the sun and the moon endure. The stream may be narrowed, it may be hidden from a careless eye under the mountains or hills, for a while; but it cannot be overcome. *God will establish it forever*, Ps. 48 : 8.

4.

In the Old Testament the Church was comprised within the narrow boundaries of the family of Abraham, of the people of Israel. Even up to the birth of our Lord, it was in a proper

sense a National Church. It was a mystery, hidden from the world (Col. 1 : 26) and kept secret (Rom. 16 ; 25, 26), that other peoples should become joint heirs with Israel in the promise of Christ through the Gospel (Eph. 3 : 4 ff.). The uncovering of this mystery is the theme of the *Acts of the Apostles*, and the history of the Church is the fulfilment of it. It was the uncovering of this mystery which St. John received, when he saw 144,000 out of Israel, "and a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations and kindreds and people and tongues, standing before the Throne and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes and with palms in their hands, crying with a loud voice, Salvation unto Him which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb." (Rev. 7 : 9, 10).

The Church of the New Testament is the One Fold of the One Shepherd brought together out of many a flock (John 10 : 16). It is the work of God in the last hour of the world.

The work of missions is the One Church of God in motion. Wherever our missions penetrate, there are cast down the bars which separate nation from nation; wherever they come, they bring near what was far off and widely apart; where they find room, they beget that oneness, which renders it possible for all men of all tongues of the earth to understand each other. The work of *missions* is the LIFE of the Catholic Church,—where it stops, blood and breath stagnate,—and the love that unites heaven and earth dies, where *it* dies. If it were possible to separate the work of missions and the Catholic Church, it would kill both.

This is the meaning of the word CATHOLIC. It denotes the glorious difference between the Old Testament and the New Testament Church. *This* has no limits, but extends as far as the clouds and the air itself. All peoples can and shall have their part in her, and she shall have her part in them.

Just as there can be times when the Church seems like a brooklet, which drips painfully through the briars, when the springs of the earth seem dry and the windows of heaven closed to it, when a scarcity of redeemed souls make even an Elias think himself forsaken; so there can be regions and lands, in

which the children of God seem sown very sparingly. But for the Church on earth there are no true statistics. Where there is but one member of it, *there is nevertheless the Universal Church.*

Not always many, not always many or even some in every place, but always and in all places *all the children of God* belong to the great kingdom of the Lord. The little flocks of all lands and times make up the innumerable throng of the Revelation, the truly Catholic Church of heaven and of Eternity.

5.

The Church is One,—eternally One, One at all times, in all places.

The Church is *One in the truth.* That which makes of all her children one congregation, is the Truth. That Truth is God's Word, for the King of Truth says, "Thy word is truth," (John 17 : 17). The Truth which out of all the believers of all ages and lands makes One Church, is the word of the apostles, for the King of Truth says to the apostles, "Whosoever heareth you, heareth me; and whosoever despiseth me, despiseth Him that sent me," Luke 10 : 16.

In the first age, when the oneness of the Church shone forth brighter than at any time since, and was remarked by all the heathen, no "œcumenical bishop," no temporal overshepherd, held her together, no living man was her centre; nor was it the universal dominion of one form of government, which produced the Church's unity; but the common truth of the apostles, known by all and acknowledged by all, made out of the most diverse men the one universal Church of God on earth. As long as the apostles lived, their spoken word was the point of unity to the Church; and after they had fallen asleep, it was their written word. From the first Pentecost the Church has been born of the word of the apostles, through the word of the apostles she has been made great, by it she has been called, enlightened, sanctified and preserved. Wisdom, understanding, discipline, fullness and satisfaction, knowledge which envelops the world like the dawn, and prophecy which abideth forever,

all, all that she has, the Church has drawn from the living spring of the apostolic word. She therefore calls herself the Apostolic Church.

What would it help if the Church had been founded by the apostles, but no longer kept their word? If she has departed from the apostles' word, her name is no more than a memorial of her lost Paradise.

It is a miracle above all other miracles that the word of the apostles has abode in the world, living, creative, and mighty,—and that wherever it has appeared the Church has gathered around it, so that it has remained the sun from which proceeded all the light and warmth in the world. The Church will be united forever through the word of the apostles, and this word, subject to no one, will be the source of one, universal, everlasting Church, to the end of days.

This is the best of all the Church's names: She is APOSTOLIC. All names become meaningless, when the Church no longer can be called apostolic. She is the candlestick; and the Word is the light.

6.

But can every man understand the Word? What would be the use of an obscure word, a spring of living water no one can get at? If the Scriptures cannot be the point of union for the Church, then is there none, for every other without the support of the Scriptures is, but vanity.

Did any one ever write a letter in order *not* to convey his meaning? Did the Lord the Holy Ghost write by Paul to the Romans and the Corinthians letters which could not be understood? to amaze poor people, and worry and frighten them?

True, without exposition a good part of the Old Testament is obscure. But the New Testament is the explanation of the Old. The New Testament is clear without the Old, but so much clearer if read with it. Peter called the Old Testament "a light shining in a dark place;" and what shall we call the New, which drives every shadow out of the Old. If that is dawn, this is day!

Does some one say, The translations of the Scriptures do not agree? No one dare say, they are false. If one alleges obscure

passages,—they are few, and unimportant, and do not darken the general sense of the Bible. The obscure passages must agree with those that are clear, because God is the author of both. No doctrine is taught in the dark passages alone; but may be known from those that are clear. Hold fast to the passages which are clear to you, and they never will deceive you. The Lord said, "Search the Scriptures." He considered them no cloudland, but a vein of eternal truth. He added, "For they testify of me;" and so we seek and can find in them witness to Him. They can make us wise unto salvation. And they are "useful for doctrine."

The Scriptures are like the starry sky. Whoever lifts his eye from the darkness of earth, sees those great stars of the first magnitude and the belt of light girdling the heavens. As they grow accustomed to the light, his eyes discern more and more stars. At length the very blue above seems interwoven with light. So the reader of Holy Scripture first meets those splendid mighty sayings, whose sense is so evident that they cannot be perverted or denied. As, strengthened by the first light, he reads on, passages which are bright and clear increase. At length he no longer sees only a milky way of bright truth in the heaven of the Bible, but a clear and conscious recognition of perfect harmony takes possession of him and exalts him.

The Scriptures always have demonstrated themselves. From the beginning there have been thousands and thousands, who through reading the Scriptures have come to one faith, viz., the original faith of the Church. Whether you look at the light of the first centuries or a later time, upon that of the Waldenses or of the Reformation, or of Spener, or of the latest awakening,—whether you accompany the Bible to Italy, or to Spain, or to the Tyrol, you will find that its clearness has produced the same one light of churchly knowledge in the souls of men.

The obscurities which are charged against the Scriptures, are in the heart and eye of man.

7.

It has been said that the Church is older than the apostolic Scriptures of the New Testament; that they received their au-

thority from her; and that therefore she is above them. It is true that the Church has borne witness to the writings of the apostles. But the divine origin of the Scriptures of the New Testament is self-evident, and distinguishes them unmistakably from all other writings in the world. How beautiful, for instance, is the *Epistle of Barnabas*, who is called by the Scriptures an apostle. Why should we not believe that Barnabas wrote it, for there is no reason to ascribe it to a later period than the apostolic age. Yet it has almost disappeared in the course of time. In the collection of the Canon of the New Testament, the Church was controlled *by the divine authority of the Scriptures*, and in her testimony she only gave back the impression which the Word of God and of men made on her. The Canon is defined by God's meaning and will, and by the character of the writings whose source is in Him. High as we may hold the service of the Church in handing down to her children and bringing to the world the truth which regenerates, nevertheless the witness of God and the truth is greater than the Church, which was born and is born of the Word.

The first Christian congregation was gathered by the spoken Word of an apostle. It is the same Word that was spoken on Pentecost and is heard to-day. Just as little as the faith of the first three thousand gave to Peter's first sermon its apostolic authority, just so little does the faith of the first three centuries give authority to the written Word of the apostles.

The centre of the Church—the Apostolic Word—never was more clearly seen than when the apostles lived and taught and wrote in the Church.

From the beginning it has pleased the Lord to spread abroad his truth through men, to increase his Church by means of the Church, to make it not only the assembly of believers, but also to make it a place of assembly for those who ought to believe and will believe. But that by which she saves others, saves her too.

8.

The Holy Scriptures describe the whole sphere of saving truth. There is no lack in them, which must be supplied by "Tradition."

No doubt the apostles said more than they wrote. The pupils of the apostles could throw light on dark places by their recollection of the apostles' oral instruction. Against doubt, this recollection would strengthen the weak. But the Church of later time is not poor because without this. We have all we need, and more too, in the clear written word of the apostles. The Spirit of prophecy is not far from His Church, and in the discipline of these eighteen hundred years He has granted her a sure instinct to recognize, accept, and apply what is necessary in every time.

There have been in the Church venerable traditions which contradicted each other. No writing of the Fathers is extant containing the traditions of the apostles. No one has collected their sayings, proved their origin and given them to us. It is ridiculous to say that any man is the depository of all the wisdom of the apostles, that his mouth pours forth infallible sayings as soon as a question touches his holy breast. How unfortunate are some of the interpretations of Scripture found in published letters of Roman bishops. How often have they been silent, when they should have spoken if they were in possession of divine truth. There are cases in which any simple man could interpret the Scriptures better than those have done, whose decree was trusted by millions. Just as foolish is it to believe that the apostolic tradition is enshrined in the decisions of *Popes and Councils.* The mistakes of Popes and Councils are historical.

To interpret Scripture by tradition is to appeal from light to darkness. In their connection, and in all particulars, the Scriptures are much clearer than the fathers are. From Moses to John they are one consistent Word of God. Every one can reach the "consensus" of prophets and apostles, of God and of His servants, in his English Bible; but who shall be able to find the consensus of the fathers? The definite written word resists perversion as the breath of the lips does not. So the pure breath from apostolic lips came to naught; but their word abides. All true readers and prayers witness that the Scriptures need no

tradition to interpret them. The Church lives by the Word, as once she lived *with* the Word.

9.

Has God called all men from darkness to light, from the power of Satan to himself?

Some say, Out of the great mass of sinful humanity God has separated a certain number for eternal life. These He has called and enlightened. But God wills that all men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth. Christ atoned for the sins of the whole world. So is it necessary that "repentance and remission of sins be preached in His name to all nations." No man should be lost for the sin he has done against the Law, for that has been answered; no one should die for the natural resistance to God's Word which is present in every heart, for the power of the Holy Ghost overcomes it through the Word in all who without wickedness hear it. A man shall be lost only through stubborn wicked resistance to the calling Word. Therefore the Word of God must come to all.

10.

In some way the invitation goes to every man to turn from the world and join the Congregation called out of the world. Those who heed it, and outwardly turn from the world, and in the sight of all confess Christ and his Church, bear the honorable name of *the Called.* And those who not outwardly alone and before the eyes of men, but inwardly and according to the judgment of the Lord Himself have separated from the world and joined His Church, and therefore in the end will be acknowledged by the Lord as His own, are *the chosen.* "Many are called, but few are chosen." All the chosen have been called. Until the day of eternity it will not be open, who in truth are the chosen.

Exactly the same thing the Lord meant in the distinction between the *called* and the *chosen*, we mean when we distinguish between the visible and the invisible Church. The host of the called is visible; it steps forth from the rest of humanity. Before the eyes of all it holds God's Word and Sacraments, and in

the ears of all it confesses Christ and His Church. The invisible Church embraces those who, having been called, let themselves be enlightened, converted, justified, sanctified and perfected through the Word of the living God. No man can certainly know which of his brethren confesses Christ, is enlightened, converted and justified, and will be preserved until death and perfected in death. All who belong to the invisible Church, belong to the visible: they utter the divinely-given thought of their hearts in word and deed. Therefore the same persons belong to the visible and the invisible Church; the visible and the invisible Church are one.

II. The Churches.

I.

Since the visible Church is the assembly of the called, it exists wherever the call of God sounds.

Philip Nicolai, the author of the famous hymn, "O Morning Star, how fair and bright," and at the same time one of the most dreaded champions of the Evangelical Church, in his book on The Kingdom of God, outlines the extension of Christianity over the whole earth. He leads the reader from the high North into all lands. Greenland, Iceland, Lapland, the Orcades, the Russian countries and those subject to the Turk, Arabia, Persia, India, China, Africa, America, are explored. The condition of Christianity in every country is examined, and the missions of Rome and the Jesuits are claimed. All this he does with such fairness and so unconcealed a joy in all that is good, that it is hard to see how the rigid Lutheran can be so without sting or envy, so mild towards those whom he elsewhere treats as foes. At the end of the first part of his book he answers the question. He praises God that the name of Christ is known everywhere. Often the good seed is mixed and sown with bad; nevertheless, the good seed grows up too, and even among Roman and Jesuit missions the desire to save souls is uppermost, and to that end they often preach so near the truth and observe so evangelical a plan, that at home they would be called heretics. "Balaam and Judas," he says, "were able to teach others, and to show them the way which they themselves forsook. Christ

commanded to follow the teaching of those who sat in Moses' seat, though they themselves despised the word of God. The apostle Paul says some preach Christ of strife, and not purely, some even out of deliberate hatred and envy of Paul, yet he adds that he rejoices and will rejoice if only Christ be preached. And the Son of God admits that false prophets can prophesy in Christ's name, cast out devils and do many wonderful works."

In the midst of the tumult of human inventions there are bits of truth, which can light simple souls to eternal life. Everywhere is Baptism, through which many thousands of children dying in youth become heirs of eternal life. Everywhere are the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Psalter, and many another fragment of Holy Scripture. And besides, the ears of the hearers often are purer than their teachers' lips. So it is possible to be saved in the communion of most of the churches. No spot of earth need be hopeless, that harbors any one of the Christian communions.

In this sense the question, *whether heretics belong to the Church*, was answered by John Gerhard. He holds it even of obstinate heretics. Even they retain something of the Church, viz. Baptism and some uncorrupted fragment of Holy Scripture. Conversions, among them are to be ascribed not to the leaven of their opinions, but to the Word itself, and to Baptism, which is effectual if its form agrees with the institution of Christ, and the error affect not the substance of the sacrament. Therefore St. Augustine holds that even after their separation heretics belong to the Church, in virtue of the sacraments which they administer rightly.

If salvation depends on comprehending the truth in its whole compass, if it is not possible to be saved with a slight knowledge and through bits of truth, very few will be saved anywhere.

Suppose that you were a pastor, called to the sickbed of a man who never in his life had minded God's Word, but now earnestly wished to be saved. Would you begin to unfold in his ears the whole system of Christian doctrine? Would you insist that he must know and understand it all? You would not have time, and the sick man would have neither time nor

strength. With Nicolaus Hunnius (in his *Epitome Credendorum*) you would hold fast the principles, "The word from which faith springs forth immediately, is the doctrine of the universal grace of God and the universal grace of the Lord Jesus Christ;" and therefore you would preach repentance and the Gospel. And if you succeeded in bringing the sick man to acknowledge his sin and long for the salvation of God in Christ,—I will not say, to trust in the merit of Christ,—and he were to die in that condition, you would fold your hands and believe him saved. What saved him, then? A little drop of truth, a little repentance, a little flight to Him who is the source of the drop and a fullness for all thirsty souls.

So in the Church to which you belong, many are saved through fragments of the truth. For even the most complete knowledge on earth is but in part.

Let us thank God that it is the Chief Parts of the Truth which remain in those communions in the Church, which yet are not incorrupt; the Law, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, Baptism, Absolution, the Holy Supper, many a noble bit of Holy Scripture, are to be found here and there, and with them the possibility of attaining to repentance and saving faith. In the history of the nations there are examples and proofs enough, and on the last day there will be enough, that in other communions than our own it is possible to find the way of life.

2.

The Visible Church, spread over the whole earth, is divided into many "particular" churches, each having its own distinctive name. Though they may agree in the chief doctrines, and in most of them Holy Baptism may be rightly administered, we may not conclude that it makes no difference to which of them we belong. While salvation may be built on parts of the truth, shining amid darkness and falsehood,—tell me, is the human heart more open to truth than to falsehood? What enters it easier, under the guise of religion, than a notion which does not vex or stay "the old man" in us, but on the other hand flatters and cher-

ishes it? A church ought to have a great deal more of truth than of error and falsehood; for error and falsehood find, in the natural corruption of the human heart, a confederate. If many falsehoods and much error have the upper hand in a particular church, it is probable that in it we might be lost. Even under the complete truth many a one has so lived that only through grace ministered by the pastor to him on his dying bed he was saved. Only by the strength of God is a man saved with the pure doctrine. How difficult must it be where error is intermixed! There is no greater folly, nor any harder to answer for, than that which trifles with eternal life.

If the differences between churches consisted merely in liturgical forms, vestments and the like, we might let every one live as he liked. But they *teach* differently. It is impossible that one Word of God should at the same time have two contradictory meanings. He who has the false meaning, is in greater danger than he who plays with fire. False teaching begets false principles, and they a false life, and that is sin; and sin is a fire which only crazy people can carry in their bosoms without thinking it will burn them.

For slight differences the churches would not have separated from each other. There are no trifles in religion. There are sects distinguished by trifles. But we speak of the great particular churches, the Roman, the Eastern, the Reformed, the Lutheran, &c. The beliefs for which they contend are worth fighting for. To wish to disregard them, is unreason, or indolence, or of utter darkness.

Either none of these have the complete truth, or but one has it. To say that none have it, is to say that in the whole course of history God has gathered not one pure Church. The Church had the truth in the time of the Apostles. Who will deny that the first centuries had it too? Would the Lord have been so good to that early time, yet left us of the latter days in mist and gloom? Why should there have been a pure Church once, but never again? Has man become worse, have the Scriptures become more obscure, has the Holy Ghost become weaker? It is easy to admit that each of the churches has its

treasure, but is there not one whose pre-eminence is its acknowledgment of the whole truth?

Apply the Touchstone, and the miserable delusion that the whole truth is nowhere to be found, will vanish.

3.

The Church is distinguished from all other associations on earth by the possession of the pure Word and Sacraments. The churches are distinguished from each other by their explanations of the Word and their peculiar administration of the Sacraments. As the Church ceases to be the Church when it no longer has the Word and Sacraments; so a Church ceases to be what it was when it loses its own explanation of the Word and its own use of the Sacraments. Therefore the distinctive mark of a church is its confession or creed. That confession must be derived from the Scriptures, if it is to have any value.

What, then, is the distinctive mark of the Church which has the whole of the truth? *The scripturalness of her confession or creed.*

Therefore compare the Confession of the Church to which you belong with the Word of God. If it be confirmed, your work is done, for no confession can do more than agree with the clear Word of God. If your Confession agrees with it, while you remain faithful to it your soul is in no danger. This will bring you great peace.

The Scriptures are clear; in matters of faith they do not require the explorations of the learned; their light suits every eye. And when they do not seem clear, they answer a question clearly. Just as when you strike flint and steel they give forth the spark, so compare what the Bible says with what men say on the same subject, and you will see what a difference there is between men's word and God's word. The spirit of man is not quick enough to grasp a truth without thinking of its opposite. It is deliberate foolishness to refuse to consider the opposite of a doctrine. The Church is in the world, and is in opposition to the world. To compare an opinion or doctrine of men with the appropriate passages of Holy Scripture, is to ask a question of

God; and He will answer it. One can learn what the Scriptures say, by comparing one point with another. Through comparison we learn to distinguish.

But what, if on comparing and distinguishing a man finds that the Confession of his own Church is not justified? He must use further effort to find the Truth and the Church of the Truth. And even after the right Church and the Truth have been found, let other confessions be tried by the touchstone of God's Word, for the sake of the joy that will be felt in possessing it, and that we may be rendered steadfast and happy in the Word of God.

5.

If our Church have the pure Word and pure Sacraments in a pure confession, then she evidently has the highest treasures of the Church unperverted. Then she has God's living fulness and the source out of which she may cure all her imperfections and may derive all the excellences of which other particular churches may justly boast. What were it to possess every other advantage, and lack the greatest treasures? Every ray of light that rests on any church, proceeds from the heart of OUR perfect Truth. Nor can the glow of human words and thoughts daze us; in possession of these treasures, one can easily forego things of less value until it is possible to get them without loss.

Here is the Holy of Holies of the house of God. If we say, "The Lord send thee help from the sanctuary, and strengthen thee out of Zion," the sanctuary and Zion are with the Church of the pure confession, in whose Word and Sacraments the Lord dwells more gloriously than in the Temple of the Old Testament. Hence proceeds salvation, for here is disclosed, not partially but completely, the clear truth of the Gospel. Whatever truths other communions possess, are here united in the Truth. The truth, kept in the fire of the centuries, the truth that overcometh the world, is here! Here it is confessed; here is protest against every perversion of it; here not a syllable of it is yielded. Let us rejoice in what we have, be a blessing to all other churches, refuse their errors, take pleasure in their truths,—fight against

their wrongdoing, and feel at one with them in all they do, that is right.

6.

But Rome says, "Where was Lutheranism before Luther?" If a church is no older than her confession, then is Rome younger than Protestantism, for only in the year after Luther's death did the Council of Trent begin, in which the confession of the Roman Church was agreed upon, and only after the close of the council was the Roman Catechism elaborated. But, of course, the question is, whether what we confess was confessed earlier than what Rome confesses.

We soon discover that the distinctive doctrines of Rome were not taught "everywhere, always and by all." It is possible to show where every one of them was first taught. What the earlier bishops of Rome taught, does not agree with what the Roman bishops of our day teach. In no diocese has one and the same doctrine been taught and confessed from the beginning. The present doctrine of Rome contradicts its earlier; and contradictions are not stages of development of the same truth.

It is true, that in the Fathers much can be found that is romanizing. But contradictions of it can be found too. It were a pity, therefore, if there were no other way of deciding the question.

If we divide "Antiquity" into two parts, which doctrine is the oldest, that which belonged to the year 40, or that which cannot be found till the year 400? Therefore let the Holy Scriptures, which preceded ecclesiastical antiquity, have the first word. The doctrine and confession which have the Holy Scriptures on their side, have antiquity on their side. Let no man be driven from the position that the Holy Scriptures are clear; and in the clear word of Holy Scripture we have a criterion by which infallibly to try both the contradictory teaching of the Fathers and the contradictory confessions of our own times. Whatever agrees with the Holy Scriptures,—that is oldest, and that is correct; and the church which has the Holy Scriptures on its side has the purest and the oldest antiquity on its side and in every age has had some, who as witnesses of the truth and

of the clearness of the divine Word, deserve more faith than the crowns and purple do, which contradict God's Word.

Now we are ready to answer the question, "Where was Lutheranism before Luther?" Forget the name and ask the meaning. It was at Jerusalem, and at Rome in the time of the apostles and in the first centuries after Christ. Where now error is taught without rebuke, the truth once was taught without rebuke; and when, as the apostles foretold, falsehood took the throne of truth, truth's first mighty protest sounded there where now no tongue speaks for the truth. And when truth was silenced in its old places, it wandered to other parts, and always had children and confessors. Though dark ages came, in which it was hard to find the truth in its beauty anywhere, or anywhere to hear the full harmonious chorus of its song, yet it never was impossible. And though the time of the Reformation was a time of complete uncovering of the sanctuary of the truth and was brighter than former times, it still is easier for us to show the hidden testimonies in the combined light of the Reformation and of the earliest times of the Church. Though we never may be able on earth to find all those who were confessors of the truth,—if the stake and massacres and the cries of the martyrs do not give us all the traces of the children of God,—yet there will be a day, in which we shall see how many the Lord had chosen for Himself in the worst eras and kept from the evil.

The children who died in their Baptismal Grace,—the simple who departed in the forgiveness of their sins,—the penitent, who died trusting Christ's blood and wounds,—all the blessed who before Luther stood before the Throne of the Lamb,—what confession, what church, did these own? That which rests on Peter's grave, or that which is built on Peter's confession? So we point to those who were children either in years or in spirit, and say, These were the Kingdom of Heaven before Luther! And we look up to Zion, and say, There was the Church! There they care not for earthly ornament, for the pomp of bishops and priests, but for the *Truth*, and the Truth is ours!

That church is oldest whose doctrine is oldest,—and that

lasts longest, whose doctrine lasts longest. That Church will outlast the world, which holds the Word in a pure Confession, the Word, of which is written, that it endureth forever. Its names and place may change; it may become big or little; it is neither maintained nor overthrown by earthly power; its progress is wonderful, sometimes on high, sometimes in the dust; but it will continue, it will outlast everything; for with it is the Way, the Truth and the Life.

7.

Our Lord called His Church "a little flock." That a Church has great numbers of adherents, therefore, is not a proof that it is the Church of Christ. The Christian Church does not embrace a moiety of the human race; and now that, after the lapse of eighteen hundred years, the Church has approved itself the highest and loveliest conception known to man, the world also enrolls itself among the confessors. Therefore we may as little be terrified to find another Church more numerous, as we may be confident on finding ourselves the stronger.

8.

The Unity of the Church is unity in the Truth, in confession, in doctrine.—The "unity" of the members of the Roman Church with their head, the Pope, is another thing. And it cannot be proved. Where was it in the beginning, for six hundred years or more? Where was it when there was no pope, or there were several at one time, or when the pope was declared a heretic by his own?

The "hierarchy," the episcopal or patriarchal govenment of the Church, has not divine right. We know an episcopate, founded on Holy Scripture, which is identical with the presbyterate, and we cannot see how there can be a Christian congregation without it. But where is there a syllable in the Bible to prove the divine right of diocesan episcopacy, of "the episcopal succession," or of the primacy of the pope? The Scriptures do not know this human invention at all. For venerable as the form of government by bishops is, and strong the claim which history urges for it, it deserves to be called only a human invention, when it asserts a divine right.

There is a unity—the unity of confession and doctrine,—a unity in faith. This our Lord and his apostles intended, and in it is the chief glory of the Church. But this is not found in the Church of Rome. There is "a succession," but not of places and persons, but of doctrine. The doctrine does not die, and wherever it is, there is the true Church, the real bishops, and the real priests. Where it is not, every other succession is a grave of the prophets, full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness. If we but have this succession of doctrine, there will be no want of power and of life to show before the eyes of men that *here* is *the Church.* Let us insist on this succession, and then nothing shall be lacking,—least of all right calling of teachers, ordination, prayer, blessing, and the gifts of the Holy Ghost to the holy Ministry.

The structure of the Church is a miracle of miracles. Its foundation seems as slight as the rainbow's; for the dwellers on earth think only earthly foundations firm. But it is founded on the eternal Word. Let us look at the Word, and in the Word be One. If our church order and discipline be faulty, we may lament it; but if the Word and doctrine rule, we may hope all things. Order, discipline, liturgy may be faulty, yet thousands will be saved if we have the Word. And there will be no forgiveness of sins, no peace in life, no hope in death, no blessedness in heaven,—no Lord's Prayer here, and no Hallelujah there —if we have not the Word. For it, we may give all else. It is the source of all good, and the death of all vanities.

"Lord, keep us steadfast in thy Word!"

9.

Over against the self-chosen works of Roman ascetics, Martin Luther pointed Christians each to his *calling.* He taught that all the deeds of a man in his calling were to be works of love, good works. That to which God did not call a man, was no good work. It was not enough that it was done in faith; it must also have God's command. God's commandments and our daily calling thus banished asceticism. The father in his home, the mother among her children, the laborers at work, the farmer in his field, the servant in kitchen and yard, were trans-

figured by this doctrine of *our calling* and of the blessing of the works of our calling. There is no longer a "common" in contrast with a "religious" life; but love finds exercise in common life. There is no distinction between Commandment and "Evangelical Counsel," between monk and man of the world, between priest and layman: there is one holiness for all believers. Each serves the Lord in his own place—and each place thus becomes an Altar of Praise to God, where His Name is glorified, His Love is shown! If we open our eyes, then, we will find saints enough among us, not clad in monkish habit, but hidden in the dress of daily life. God grant us many of *our* Saints, and let us see their glory on that day!

10.

The preservation of the Church under all the attacks of the devil and his hordes these 1800 years, her unbroken, fresh and youthful strength to-day, were miracle enough, if the voice of the Truth were not penetrating and mighty enough without it. And indeed, it were easy to be deceived by miracles. There are wonders, which seem like miracles, and therefore must be distinguished from them. Real miracles are done by God alone, either immediately or through his servants, (Ps. 72 : 18). But false prophets, the Antichrist, the Beast, can do wonderful things that seem like miracles (Matt. 24 : 24; 2 Thess, 2 : 9; Rev. 13 : 13). It is therefore necessary to *try* the miracles we may see, and to observe this rule: *True miracles can be done only in the service of the pure doctrine, and without the longknown pure doctrine of the clear Word of God, miracles prove nothing.* Deut. 13 : 1–5.

And so is it with *prophecies.* We do not deny that the spirit of prophecy still lives, and still is in the Church. But we hold that all prophecy must agree with the faith. A prophecy which does not confirm the true doctrine and is not in connection with it, is vain and worthless. (Deut. 13 : 1–5). One that rests on purely human grounds and does not proceed from the Holy Ghost, is a conjecture, not a prophecy; like that of Balaam (Num. 24), or that of Caiaphas (John 11 : 51), it is no warranty

of the man. Therefore prophecies as well as miracles must be tried by the received faith of the Church. (Rom. 12 : 7).

III. Our Church.

I.

In the age just preceding the Reformation so many novelties and abuses had come up in the Roman Church, that in all the countries of Europe the more prudent were filled with displeasure. Many attempts at reformation were made before Luther, as the Councils of Constance and Basel may testify. The miscarriage of these attempts only increased the longing for deliverance.

In the fulness of time the Lord sent deliverance. He had brought to pass a hitherto unknown revival of the study of the Greek and Hebrew tongues. This led men back to the sources of religion, to the Old and New Testaments. The less they had known of these, the more were men amazed at the contradiction they found between these sources of truth and the doctrine and Church of their time. The clearness of the divine Word could not have astonished more, than after a period of such deep sleep. And its contradiction of the doctrine and Church of the time was not only surprisingly clear; it was transporting. Above all things the Reformers demanded *agreement with the Word of God.*

There were two ways of answering this. On one side, everything was regarded as a miserable remnant of popery which had not a word of the Holy Scriptures for it. With inexorable rigor everything was cast away, for which an express foundation in the Scriptures could not be found. On the other hand, in spite of equal earnestness in Reformation, everything was kept which had not Scripture *against* it, and which could be *retained* without danger to the pure doctrine. For instance, the Liturgy, the pictures in the churches, and their other ornaments, were treated differently, according as men followed the one or the other tendency.

The latter tendency acknowledged that the Church had not lived 1500 years since the Apostles' time in vain. The Apos-

tolic doctrine had unfolded in the course of history, and in the progress of the time the One Word had revealed an ever richer fulness. The history of the Church was regarded, and fellowship with antiquity. They aimed not to cut loose from preceding centuries, and to begin something new and independent; but on the other hand endeavored by means of the clew of Holy Scripture to continue the Apostolic Church and to cleanse it of novelties. Not that they wished to have everything just as it was in the time of the Apostles, but to make the historical development of the Church unblamable in the presence of the Apostles and Prophets. They acknowledged that the Holy Ghost rules in history; but nothing is His work which contradicts the clear Word. *Unity of Scripture and History, Communion with the Scriptures above all and with the pure Church of all ages and lands, true Catholicity* marked the latter tendency, the tendency of Luther. Compare his course with Carlstadt's; read the Symbolical Books; and you shall see this harmonious conception of Scripture and History, this conviction of a pure Church, that never has perished, this hatred of what is new, this regard for the old, this comparison of what is venerable with what was before it.

Therefore the German Reformers continually appealed to a universal, free, Christian Council. They hoped to persuade the whole world that they were trying to put away only novelties and abuses, and not the harmless usages of the past. In this sense they made their Confession at Augsburg in 1530. With the light of the divine Word in their hand, they moved through all centuries and lands, rejoiced in every pure, churchly, scriptural confession and life, recognized in such the witness of the same Spirit that controlled them, and never dreamed that any one could charge them with falling away from the One ancient Catholic Church without sinning against his own conscience. Yes, so firm was their conviction that they were the children of the Apostles and the Fathers, so tranquil their conscience resting in acknowledged Truth, that they saw in their opponent's insistence on the distinctive doctrines and abuses of Rome nothing but apostasy from the ancient doctrine. And when the

Council of Trent (1545–1563) solemnly adopted the new Romish doctrines and abuses, then the Fathers of our Church declared: Now first has that been made the property of the Roman Church which hitherto was only filth upon its face and feet; now has Rome apostatized; and now is it evident that the primitive and ancient Church, separated from Babylon and from Rome, is to be found in the fellowship of those they call *Lutherans.* In contrast with this fallen Church, the Lutherans call themselves Catholic and Apostolic.

And who dare blame them? The ancient pure Church of the West lives where the ancient pure doctrine of the ancient pure Church is preached. All things are ours, whether Christ, or Paul, or Peter, whether Linus or Anacletus or Clemens, whether Cyprian or Augustine. The cloud of witnesses of all past time has come over to us. With us is their knowledge, their wisdom, their peace, their joy, their strength, their patience—and blessed be God therefor!

2.

Is the reformation of the Church complete? It is complete in doctrine, but it is incomplete in the consequences of doctrine.

There were controversies between confessors of the pure doctrine, but, as in the controversies of the first Centuries, under the dust of the strife, a sweet fruitage of righteousness and peace was won.

There are indeed theologians at the present day who think that in the study of doctrine many victories are yet to be won. The Church is the bearer of a certain knowledge of God, a custodian of immortal truth. Her children can grow to manhood only through knowledge and appreciation of that which has been from the beginning.

But it were well to give to the pure, rich doctrine free course. There never has been a time in which men were fully conscious of its worth and earnestly considered how much could be accomplished by it for the world and for the Church. From the pure doctrine comes forth a correct judgment of everything that is earthly and passing. Let us not be too narrow in holding on to certain forms and outward things which have been since the

Reformation. With many an abuse a pious use was thrown away at that time. Let us set the light of the true doctrine on a candlestick, so that the nations may see and rejoice in this free city for all the unhappy, in her, who having freely received, freely gives, that which saves!

3.

It is the great calling of the true Church to teach the true point in which all the churches can unite, and continually to oppose to the contradictions of the churches that what all are seeking, rightly understood, is united in her doctrine. Far from seeking union by overlooking undeniable differences, far from attempting to force a union by human authority, the true Church prays without ceasing for the union of all souls in one pure doctrine, and hopes that all the sheep of the Good Shepherd may hear His voice in the preaching of the pure doctrine and may gather in one fold. But she knows her vocation too clearly, and is too conscious of her treasure, the pure confession and the pure doctrine, to encourage the expectation that she will ever modify her confession for the sake of union. She, the guardian of the pure doctrine, cannot give up any part of the truth she has learned, of the right measure of all the thoughts of God, of the panacea for the world, without unfaithfulness to God, who gave her this trust, and transgression of her calling.

The earliest confession did not answer all the questions which must be met. The questions of men must have a sufficient answer. The Church must possess complete truth, before she can realize God's loving thought in her heavenly calling. Therefore let no portion of truth be yielded that was won so bitterly! Let us not treat that lightly, which God entrusted to us, and will ask of us again!

The pure Church holds what she has. She is honest against every error. She says NO, a simple, quiet, earnest, firm, *No*, to everything that is not true. She is consistent in this testimony. But she says YES, a simple, tranquil, joyful *Yes*, to everything that is true, wherever she may find it. She confesses her unfaithfulness and sin against the blameless glorious confession

that she has to bear before all the world,—she confesses her own sin, and does not condone the sin of others. She yields not a tittle of the truth. This may offend those who are not of a pure heart; but if they begin to attack and condemn her for cleaving to the truth, she may remember the word, "I am for peace; but when I speak, they are for war."

This true, patient, unterrified witness the Lord uses to bring the hearts of men to unity. It is indeed vain to hope that all will come to the narrow way; but still we may hope that God will increase His Church and make the truth victorious over falsehood.

4.

The torch of the pure truth is to be carried to all peoples. We pray the Lord to forgive us, that hitherto we have done so little for the heathen. The Lord can raise up among us hosts of evangelists, who can go into the ways of the heathen and testify to them the universal grace of God in Christ Jesus. And if the Lord increases us in the old lands of Christendom, and gives us new strength, the fire of one united love will show itself yet more mightily among the heathen. We pray the Lord to fill our hands with salvation for the heathen; and He will do it!

5.

The Lord gives His Holy Spirit only by means of His Word and Sacraments; therefore these are the Church's only means. She knows that in the work of his salvation a man can do no more than to lend his ear to the Truth of God, as he might lend his ear to any other word; and therefore, above all things she seeks to admonish, to urge, men to hear and to heed the Word of God. She knows that the spiritual man is not always able to hear and to consider the Word of God; and still less does she expect the child of this world to give much time to the hearing of it. She knows that a man is more likely to open the sanctuary of his heart to the Truth if it be given him sparingly, than if its voice is heard without ceasing. Therefore she gives to the people enough, but not too much, of her means. She is not abashed if some one says: "This pastor thinks it enough, if he

preach, catechise, administer the Sacraments, hear confession, and comfort the sick!" She knows that the most faithful pastor cannot do enough of this. She thinks but little of increasing the means of ministerial usefulness, but much of the right use of the Means enjoined in the Scriptures and acknowledged from the beginning. To many it is a novel wisdom, not to be ingenious, but rather to be master of the few noble means; but the Church has always understood this. With one word: *She does much, by a few means.*

To one who compares the advice which Baxter gives to a pastor, or Gottfried Arnold, with the pastoral-books of our fathers, at first it seems that the latter suggest too few methods, and that Baxter and Arnold had a higher notion of a pastor than, for instance, Balduin and others. But a man of experience sees otherwise. Enough and more than enough is done, if one has accomplished all that belongs to the performance of the old traditional duties of the Ministry. The poverty of our fathers is richer than the riches of their critics. By alternation of privacy and publicity, of silence and outspokenness, through faithful use of Word and Sacraments, through modesty and steadfastness, the Church reaches her ends.

She therefore cares little for modern and highly-praised means to further good work. She does not try to stimulate good works by the methods of business. She recognizes that works which depend upon the methods of modern societies easily suppress other works, disturb the harmony of the many gifts of the Spirit, and make men one-sided and intemperate. She does not adopt the shibboleth of human extravagance in works; but she encourages to the performance of all good, and exhorts every one to do according to his gift and in his place and calling that which is well-pleasing to God. She endeavors to unite *all* good works in her midst. The care of the poor, she recognizes to be the duty of the Church, as it was in the Apostles' age; the School is still the Church of the children, and her own kingdom, as in former days; the sick, the stranger, the orphan, still are her charge; she still cares for the maintenance of her ministers, and that the house of God be such as to serve its end. Her

bishops or pastors unite the congregations in all good; they give to every good work its measure according to the Word; they lead and feed the people. The Church as a whole, the congregations singly, *embrace all good works*,—and what is done is done *in unity of the flocks with their shepherds.* In obedience to the Word, without debate and rivalry, in holy tranquillity, all is mightily done for which the Lord gives ability and grace. So the Church has many activities, though the means by which she does all and encourages to all good, always are the same: the Word, the Sacrament, the holy office of the Ministry.

Few Means—many good works! That is the rule of the Church.

6.

Among the means which the Church uses for the salvation of soul, the Pulpit stands first. It is the means of calling those who stand at a distance, and of making those who have come at her call sure in their calling and election. It is not her aim to support the Word by human arts of speech; but the main thing is not to hinder its powerful operation, and not to force upon it a method which does not belong to it. The preacher preaches salvation in Christ Jesus, with the consciousness that not his work, but the noble contents of the Word itself must bring the souls of his hearers to God. Certainly the preacher believes and therefore speaks, but a faithful preacher does not aim to recommend the truth by *his* faith and experience, but rather to bring his people to say with the Samaritans: "Now we believe, not because of thy saying: for we have heard Him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world." An upright preacher is a faithful witness of the Word, and the Word testifies to him; he and it appear as one. All his preaching is based on holy peace. Even when he rebukes and the zeal of God's house eats him up, it is not the anger of the restless world, but the wrath of the God of peace, which is awakened in him. He is nothing, and Christ in him is all.

In his confidence in the divine Word he despises all slavery to method. His method is simplicity, directed by the occasion

and the Word. He does not try to win friends to the Lord Jesus by human eloquence, excitement of feeling, and play upon the nerves. He does not aim at a disturbed awakening, but at a revolution produced by the thoughts of God. As the heavenly calling goes on to enlightenment, and each step of progress in the inner life depends on an increase of knowledge, so he seeks to make known the holy thoughts of the divine Word and to bring them to the recollection, consideration, acceptance, and inmost soul of his hearers. He does not contemn the affections, but stirs them by silently holding before them the heavenly light, and knows that its ray brings also warmth. His watchword is not "Awake," but those words of the Scriptures which tell of the gradual and silent growth of the divine seed. He is not impatient, but waits upon the Word. He waits, knowing that the choicest fruits do not ripen in a day; and he waits on *all* his sheep, for he knows that the Lord has His time, and sometimes hastens, but sometimes waits.

The preacher of the Church is therefore no friend of "New measures," but keeps to the old measures of patient fidelity to the Word and pure doctrine.

This spirit governs the selection of his text. He rejoices in the Gospels and Epistles for the Church Year which have come down to us from early times. He never is tired preaching on the Gospels. The people like them best, and to him they are fuller and richer the oftener he preaches on them. The longer he uses them the more does he learn the great art of a preacher, to lead his people to what they do not know through what they do know, and to show all the doctrines of the Church in the well-known text. He who changes his texts every year, is not a good preacher for the people, nor, we may say, for the Church. They more cheerfully receive fresh truth, if it comes as the freshly-recognized fullness of the old truth. The *Epistles* belong to the minor services of Sunday. The Epistles agree with the Gospels, the Apostles with Christ—in all is One Faith, One Order of Salvation, One Sanctification.

For weekday services Luther advised a continuous explana-

tion of the Bible. Yet no preacher can attempt a complete exposition of every word of it. It is not necessary to accurately expound every conjunction, preposition, noun and verb; but everywhere he selects the clear passages, through them to confirm what the people know and to show it in a new light. His prophecy always is according to the analogy of faith, and he always gives to the people what in the light of their Catechism and the Gospels they can understand. He aims not at explanation of obscurities so much as confirmation and preservation in that which is clear. This is the way of simplicity, profitable to all, possible to all, though it may not seem learned. A fair example of it is seen in Luther's explanation of the Bible in comparison with Calvin's. The latter seeks an accurate understanding of the language; the former endeavors to confirm the clear doctrine of the Scriptures. Calvin is accurate (as indeed it is well for a theologian to be), but Luther selects, writes as a pastor, is always girt about the loins and shod to fight for the Gospel of peace and the faith; *and this is good for the vacillating minds of the lay and the learned.*

7.

The Small Catechism of Luther is a confession of the Church, and of all the confessions the most familiar to the people, and the most congenial to them. It is the only Catechism in the world that a man *can pray.* Justus Jonas said of it, "Though it costs but six pfennigs, it is worth six thousand worlds."

Though thousands of explanations of the Catechism have been printed, so that there is a very deluge of them, Luther's own words are the ark upon the flood, which saves *some,* while the flood itself kills.

The Catechism should not be covered under explanation and addition, but is itself the *end* of instruction. In times when there was much more general knowledge of the faith than there is now, lectures on it were read in the Universities. Few are able to set forth the richness of its thought. It was composed for simple pastors. It is a measure which reaches to all, great and small.

It gives to the people a standard, by which to try everything, so that they may not be tossed about by every wind of doctrine, by the deceit of men and cunning craftiness. It establishes their hearts in the Word of God. The teacher in the Church rejoices to find in it a standard for his teaching, and for others a standard for their learning.

The Catechism was written not only for the Church and the School, but also for the HOME. House, School and Church are made one Church by means of the precious Catechism. It is so wretchedly learned and singsonged, and sounds so wooden and empty, because treated as if it were not practical wisdom for daily life, but only a child's task at school. It belongs to the lips of all, as a battlecry belongs to all who are united in one host. The father, the children, the household should use, pray, learn, prize it; and so it will become the cruse of the widow of Sarepta, that never fails.

It is divine in the text, human in its faithful questions. It is a battlecry, which, spoken from the depths of the soul, can overthrow the strongholds of Satan. Let it be quoted and praised, that it may help to establish the unity of the Church, that great and small, learned and unlearned, may have something in which they are at one, and in the tumult of the age may know that they are at one.

8.

We shall wait in vain for the strait and narrow way to become broad.

A pastor's care is for each one of his flock. The centre of it is in *personal Confession*, a custom of the Church, which now has fallen into disuse. We do not mean the auricular confession of the Papacy, but personal confession, private absolution. To this must be added an exercise of discipline. The Absolution is valuable, if there may be an excommunication also. Without education and discipline, there is no pastoral care. The mildness of a father is of use only when he is also severe at the proper time.

9.

The Church not only is taught; she prays. Not only do the members of the Church pray in their closets; they pray together in common worship. She says, she sings, her prayers. And the Lord dwells among her praises with His Sacraments. Her drawing nigh to him, and His drawing nigh to her,—the sacred forms of her approach and His coming,—this we call the Liturgy, the Service. These forms are free; very few of them have been commanded; but in spite of her freedom the Church from the beginning has declared her pleasure in certain forms. In the course of time a holy wealth of songs and prayers have been gathered. In holy childlike innocence, which only a childlike and innocent heart can rightly understand, the host of redeemed and sanctified children of God move about the Universal Father and the Lamb, and the Spirit of the Lord God conducts them. The heavenly joy which those who can take pleasure in it find, in their participation in the Liturgy, cannot be expressed; it affects others too; and the pure confession of the Truth is never so lovely and so inviting as when it is heard in adoration and praise.

This the Reformers knew. The traditional forms of worship were not put away, but cleansed from sin and stain. The Lutheran liturgies unite variety and simplicity. To these are to be added the glorious store of inimitable hymns, which for three hundred years have been sung to the glory and praise of God.

In days of humiliation the children of the Church in losing her faith lost also her prayers and song, the ornament and glory of her worship of God, and now it is no easy task to bring the older back to the old faith, and the young to the confession of their forefathers, and all together to the innocence and childlikeness that can rejoice before God in song and prayer. Habits must be formed; and that which seems unnatural must be made natural by use.

The Liturgy is a fruit of the inner life. But like a sweet fruit of a good tree it can be made a food, which will make men hunger for more.

Yet the Church remains what she is, even without the Lit-

urgy. She is a queen, even in beggar's rags. It is better to give up all else and hold only the pure Truth, than to maintain glorious services, which are without light or life, because they are without the pure doctrine. Yet the Church need not go in beggar's rags. The true faith speaks not in the sermon only, but it prays in the prayers, and is sung in the holy songs. The Liturgy strengthens the Church against her enemies. It is a two-edged sword for the wars of the Lord.

10.

The more steadfastly the Church recognizes herself, her firm foundation in the Doctrine of God's Word, her place among Confessions and in the world,—the greater blessing will attend her faithfulness. Our Church is not identical with the Church Invisible; among us are hypocrites enough, who shall be lost; nor are all the children of God on earth reckoned to her, for many in other confessions have enough for eternal life in fragments of her wealth. But she is purest, pure in doctrine and confession; and he who lets her word and confession live in him, without doubt is a child of God, an heir of heaven, a joint heir with Jesus Christ. The Lord is among us. Let us be one, brethren, and our oneness in the primitive Truth and our joy in the Lord will be our strength. Let us worthily stand for the holy Church, in the midst of the confessions, in love and earnestness. Let us recognize the duty of our Church in the work of Missions, and carry her light into all lands. Let us be one. Let us be one before our people. Let one Word and doctrine, one manner of teaching, one song of praise, be among us.

Our unity is in the Almighty Word of Almighty God. The world shall know that we are His disciples. For our Church has never lacked but one thing to be a blessing to all the world, and that is—Unity.

One God, One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism,
One Exodus, One Way, One Door!
Praise be to God, who helpeth us.
Amen.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE CHRIST OF ALL DAYS.

By Rev. Edwin Heyl Delk.

Phillips Brooks was fond of declaring that what happened to Christ during his earthly career has been repeated in the after history of the Church. Other Herods have attempted, by violence or grave discussion, to murder the new born life, only to repeat the doom of the first Herod—"they are dead that sought the young child's life." Other men have gathered around Him, with their preconceptions and spiritual blindness, attempting to give Him directions and place in the social order. Men of later ages have followed Him because it was profitable and comfortable. Still He gathers about Him the care-worn and sin-cursed multitude. Later days felt the calm, cool touch of His healing hand. The Scribes of nearer centuries sought to entangle Him in His talk. The eighteenth century Sadducee, and the nineteenth century Pharisee, repeated the skeptical sneer and the selfish shibboleth. Later Pilates, upon the judicial bench, have compromised with crime and sought, with pitiable care, to wash His blood stains from their hands. Later high priests of some popular cult have sought to minimize His claims to divinity. The rabble ever since has hooted at Him, and bestial militarism has cast lots again for His seamless garment. Strong hands and bleeding hearts have borne Him, since the Arimathean Joseph, to the tomb, or sought to caress His risen body. Later souls have been set on fire and like human torches of sacrifice have moved east and west, south and north until, to-day, the darkest nook of Africa catches the glimmer of the approaching Sun of Righteousness.

It is small wonder then, if we find the mental history of His disciples repeated, in varied forms, during the centuries subsequent to apostolic times. Thanks to Beyschlag with his *New Testament Theology*, and Wendt in his *Teaching of Jesus*, we

have been taken back to the primal facts and earliest conceptions of Christianity. Under the leadership of these master critics, the whole New Testament drama is unfolded in intelligible sequence. That there was a *gradual* apprehension of the greatness of Jesus, by his first followers, no sane reader of the New Testament can doubt. Christ's initial manifesto, "The kingdom of God is at hand," at once provoked a conflicting group of opinions. First, as simple prophet He was attended by sympathetic pupils. Later, His marvelous power over sea and human life put him in a place apart from the progressive rabbi and brought hundreds to his ministry. Gradually the idea that the Galilean was the Messiah found lodgment in the expectant heart of His disciples. They became eager to declare the advent of the Messianic reign. Their materialistic conception of the Kingdom of Heaven was rebuked by Jesus. Later, the belief in His virgin-birth placed Him in a position apart and above all mortals. Gradually, the transcendent, spiritual nature of "The Christ" dawned upon them and, as He unfolded His final return to judge all nations of the earth, love expanded into adoration. Then came the shock of His crucifixion and death. Finally, His triumphant, assuring resurrection and flight to the bosom of God. Then St. John, ripe in years and in spiritual vision, realizes Jesus as the Eternal Word, as God incarnate, by whom, and in whom, all things exist. Thus was completed the cycle of their apprehension of Jesus. It was not the essential but the fragmentary, partial Christ which they at first, and for years, entertained and reverenced.

Now, what was enacted in the early history of our Lord and his disciples, has been, in some way, repeated by the after centuries. First, one phase of his character, then, another element of his being, later still, another quality of his person has been seized upon and presented as the all-important factor of his life. Although there has been a continuity in Christian thought concerning Christ, each age has thrown its peculiar light upon his abiding features, and the portrait presented has been brightened or darkened, etherealized, or humanized, according to the mental and social type of the theological epoch.

The winsome, shepherding feature of his nature received the first recognition by the persecuted worshipers in the Roman catacombs. Greek thought caught up the Hebrew delineation of the Synoptists and gave philosophic enlargement to their portrait of Jesus. The Pauline symbols of divine law were hardened by the Latin theologian into a dogmatic governmentalism of polity and faith. Later, the austere, vengeful quality of the "judge of all the earth" was pictured in mediæval fresco and mosaic. For years the figure of the real Jesus was obscured by the multitude of obtruding saints and the glorified virgin. Then, at the Reformation, a large part of the essential Jesus was recovered for the Church, but, later, orthodox rationalism could not keep its brush off the portrait, and its divine-human features were hardened into almost stony aloofness. The metaphysical, instead of the actual Christ was made the test of allegiance. Accuracy in defining his person, rather than largeness of personal correspondence was the test of orthodoxy. Under the dominion of this over emphasis of the intellectual apprehension of Christ, the Church labored for two hundred years. Within our own century, under the leadership of Maurice and Bushnell, there has been a re-birth of the idea of God's fatherhood. This point of view, new to English thought, has brought a rightful humanizing of the divinity of our Saviour and given his ethics and his person a new significance. The demand of our age is for fact, for personality, for personality at its finest ethical expression. It is the ethical Christ which commands the attention of the age. One of the most notable books of the day has as title—"The Christ of To-Day." Dr. Gordon, in that notable book, clearly recognizes that the Christ of to-day is the ethical Christ and rightfully seeks to complete the partial grasp of our popular thinking, by stating the necessary revelatory and metaphysical background out of which perfect character must proceed. Divine acts must find their rootage in divine life. The real Christ of to-day is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. It is the essential, the perennial Christ upon which we are to think and build the superstructure of our lives. The "New Theology"

must be the old, the oldest, the New Testament thought of Jesus; or it too must give us a fragmentary Christ.

Our knowledge of the heavens has come and will come only by patient observation through long centuries, and from different points of view. Astrology was succeeded by a crude astronomy. This blundering and partial astronomy was rectified and enlarged by wider observation and more exact calculation. Only a part of the heavens can be delineated by the astronomer who resides in Stockholm. Some man must go to Australia, if another section of the starry world is to find its rightful place in the astronomical scheme. A half century must pass, and men drag their telescopes to mountain tops, if the dashing comet of a past generation is to be seen by a later. From far apart points of vantage, men bring their varied observations and they are finally builded into one perfect, fiery, majestic, procession of the spheres.

Dare we look for any lesser analogy in picturing man's discovery and delineation of Jesus? He whom the heaven of heavens can not contain could not be depicted in a century. From different points of view, His full-orbed greatness has been gathered. Because He is the Christ of all days, *all* great and noble thought of Him must be gathered from every creed and confession.

THE NATURE OF CHRIST.

"What think ye of Christ?" "Whose son is he?" These questions were never more vital that to-day. He stands forth in the pages of the sacred Book a perpetual challenge to the mind and heart of mankind. He stood before friend and enemy and asked with grave, far reaching purpose—"Which of you convinceth me of sin?" Such a unique phenomenon in the history of mankind must be crushed or adored. Such moral perfection rising in the midst of an organically corrupt race must be accounted for. He must be convicted and rejected, or believed and enthroned.

His complete claims may be represented by two Biblical titles, "Son of Man" and "Son of God." The first was his own

favorite designation, adopted from the book of Daniel. The second title, used occasionly by Jesus in the synoptic gospels, finds its fullest expression in St. John's record. His first and constant claim was to be "the Son of Man." For the Jew, this unique title suggested the Messiah that was to come. Again and again, the question "Art thou the Messiah that is to come" was put to Him by friend and foe. Again and again, did He refrain from making a full acknowledgment of the implication. He knew He was the promised Messiah but around that idea had grown so many crude and fanciful notions of the Messianic reign that He saw the first need of the people was a spiritualizing of their conception of "The Son of Man." His "son of man" had a larger significance than their "Messiah." His was race old and world wide. Their's was tribal born and nation hemmed.

His claim made Him the new head of an old race, the second Adam in the moral history of the world. His claim made Him the supreme man of all ages past and to come. His claim made Him the focus of all the world's wisdom, power and affection." "I am the light of the world," "All power is given me in heaven and on earth," "I am the way, the truth and the life. no man cometh unto the Father but by me," these are a few of His stupendous claims. Do the thought and deeds and relation of Jesus to God and man substantiate his claim? To attempt to measure His thought aright, to enumerate his gracious deeds, and depict His tender relation to God, and His transforming relation to other men would carry us too far afield. Jesus still stands as the supreme spiritual teacher of the race. Whatever wise maxims Confucius may have given; whatever beautiful and optomistic interpretation of the universe we find in the Rig-Veda; whatever vivid contrast between the good and evil principle in life has been furnished by Zoroaster; whatever tender philanthropy was inculcated by Buddha; whatever triumphant moral contests are contributed by the religious dramas of Greece and the philosophy of Plato; whatever majestic conceptions of righteousness are depicted in the monotheism of Moses; in the teachings of Jesus, we find all these scattered elements of truth caught up and given a setting and an interpretation which

places His thoughts as the completed, spiritual focus of the world's noblest creeds.

His *deeds*, when brought to the more trying test of life, stamp with undeniable evidence His claim to moral perfection. In storm and calm; on the sea, or in the secrecy of the home; before the rabble, or before Herod; with His enemies, on the sunny sea beach, or nailed to His uplifted cross; when flattered, or taunted; on the Mt. of Hatti, nor in bloody Gethsemane; He never breaks from the minutest law of righteousness, or mars the communion of His eternal sonship with God. Other great natures may have preached truth, and plead for perfect virtue, but Jesus was equal to His word and realized in His own personality what was but dogma in the lives of other men. He still stands the one perfect embodiment of all that is strong, brave, true, pure, sympathetic and gracious in humanity. He is humanity at its highest, the flower and perfume of the race, "*The* Son of Man" among the sons of men. He is the world's high-priest because, although tempted in all points like as we are, yet He was without sin, and now, as then, "can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities."

If He was, and is the Son of Man, He was, and is just as truly "Son of God." We might base our belief on His own claim. If He encouraged His disciples to speak of "Our Father who art in heaven," He did not include Himself with them in such an address. Where He wished to speak of the Father who was common to them and Him, He adopted the particular expression, "My Father and your Father." Though the actual occasion of the phrase throws it into the lips of His adversaries, it was, we may rest assured, a phrase of His own: "He said that God was *His own* Father"—His Father, that is, in a peculiar and appropriate sense—"making himself equal with God." If there was some malicious exaggeration of his enemies in this latter charge, as Jesus seems to imply in the answer He makes, "the Son can do nothing of Himself," at least there is none in the former phrase, which exactly conveys the thought running through all His discourses, that God is His own Father. Clearly does He declare "He that sent me is with me; He hath not lef-

me alone; for I do always the things that are pleasing to him." It is this perfect correspondence to the will of God, rather than to Jesus own claim to an unique divine Sonship, which furnishes the most convincing proof of His divinity. Permit me, however, for a moment to pause and state the philosophic background for the incarnation. Creation is the world old, progressive, individuation of God. The world, however crude its form, must be a part of His being. Just how much of God's being has been poured into rock and stream, just how much richer in His life the flower and butterfly may be, just how much fuller of His substance the lion and the deer are, to assert how much of God there is in human life and divine sacrament is beyond the knowledge of man, but of one man it could be said, "that in Him dwelt *all* the fulness of the God-head bodily." Yes, bodily, for, if Jesus stood for anything, he stood for the fullest and clearest revelation of the Father, within the prison of human flesh. The doctrine of evolution has brought reinforcement to the doctrine of the incarnation. God has unveiled himself, at last, in the person of Jesus.

Let us return now to our claim that the perfection of the character of Jesus demands as a postulate His unique sonship with God.

The ethically perfect Christ must be explained. I know what the modern popular teacher is likely to say. "Granted," I hear him say, "the sinlessness and moral perfection of Jesus, why do you want to go back of His immaculate life to inquire into his genesis and nature?" Because, we reply, every phenomenon must have a cause. Because you can't have perfect actions without perfect character. Because you can't have perfect character without some superhuman addition to the race's moral stock in trade. The question of being always lurks behind human and divine action. A recent writer has said, "All religious philosophy will admit that in God there is the Eternal Prototype of humanity. All intelligent religious thinking must recognize in the Deity an eternal basis for the nature, the advent, the career and ideal, of mankind. What possible interest can human beings have in the Infinite if society is not organized out of his

life, if he is not the ground of its order and hope? What do we mean by the Being in whom every fatherhood in heaven and earth is named, if our God is not a fulness of love, if he is not in his innermost nature an eternal society? Is there anything in the Infinite to account for humanity? That is the deepest question in religious philosophy, and thinkers are everywhere converging upon the conclusion that in God there is the Eternal Pattern of our race. And what is this Eternal Pattern, or Prototype, but the Son of Man of the synoptic gospels, the Only Begotten of the Fourth Gospel, the Mediator of the Pauline Epistles, the High Priest without descent, with neither beginning of days nor end of years, of the letter to the Hebrews, the God of God, Light of Light, begotten, not made, of the Nicene Creed, who for us men and our salvation, came down, was made flesh, and became man. * * Loose out of faith the sense of the Eternal in Christ, fail to recognize in Him the presence of the Absolute, miss the fact that his nature is rooted in the Deity and part of the nature of God, and we let go the sole adequate support for belief in the consubstantiation of humanity with divinity, and the consciousness that Jesus is the moral ideal for mankind."

The difference that He presents to other men is not simply a difference of degree, but a difference in *kind.* The moment we admit Him to the exalted niche of sinlessness, and moral perfection, that moment he is in a class apart, and the ineffable beauty of His personality demands a closer relation to God than all other men born of women. It is because we find in Him the eternally human, and the humanly divine, that the poet can reverently declare

"If Jesus Christ is a man—
And only a man—I say
That of all mankind I cleave to Him,
And to Him will I cleave alway.

If Jesus Christ is a God—
And the only God—I swear
I will follow Him through Heaven and Hell,
The earth, the sea, and the air."

HIS WORK.

Every personality carries with it an influence. The measure of that influence furnishes the final estimate of the character. Reaching through nineteen centuries, we find a certain influence and institution which we call Christianity. Never was its power more effective than to-day. However much it has been caricatured, or debased, by priests and princelings, the main, vitalizing stream of its beneficent power surges onward into the centuries. However much its power has been augmented by philosophy, organization and wealth, its original life and redemptive force is not difficult to trace. "All great currents of history have flowed from persons. The world moves by personality. Christianity has a doctrine. But the force of Christianity, that which made it move and lent it power to move the world, is the person at the heart of it, who gives vitality to the organization and reality to the doctrine." Christ was his own gospel. Dr. Van Dyke has recently said:

"This was the secret of his ministry. He himself was the central word of His own preaching. He offered himself to the world as the solution of its difficulties and the source of a new life. He asked men simply to believe in Him, to love Him, to follow Him. He called the self-righteous to humble themselves to His correction, the sinful to confide in his forgiveness, the doubting to trust his assurance, and the believing to accept His guidance into fuller light. To those who became His disciples he gave doctrine and instruction in many things. But to those who were not yet His disciples, to the world, he offered first of all Himself—not a doctrine, not a plan of life, but a living Person. This was the substance of His first sermon when He stood up in the synagogue at Nazareth, and, having read from the book of Isaiah the prophecy of the Great Liberator, declared unto the people, "This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears." This was the attraction of his universal invitation, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." This was the heart of his summary of his completed work when he said, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me."

Now, the first element of His work which distinguishes Christ is that He saves from sin. Let all mere doctrines of sin, atonement and justification be, for the present, forgotten and let us look at the bare facts of history. In His presence the publican and the harlot broke down, and all their brazen challenge of social law ceased, amid the sobs of a melting penitence. At His feet, the burdened consciences of millions of lives have been laid. Before His cross, uncounted multitudes have been checked in their reckless career of sinful indulgence. At His word, the uplifted hand of murderous anger has dropped at the side of the enraged assailant. At His glance, the endangered chastity of his spiritual children has been protected and enshrined. Stumble as we may over the mere explanation of his redemptive power, the fact that at His feet the hatred of sin, and the sense of pardon is realized by countless men and women is beyond denial. From sheer love of Him thousands, who have come up out of sin, stand as living witness of His transmitted grace and righteousness. This is the gospel needed for our age of doubt. Jesus Christ is the great, living, redemptive force of the age. For a higher appreciation of this fact, one has but to turn to that Oriental religion which makes the nearest approach, in its ethics, to Christianity—Buddhism. Who that knows Buddhism, in theory and practice, would make any serious claim for its moral and spiritual dynamic. Beautiful as may be the mythic life of its founder, his practical atheism, and passive acquiescence in the endless cycle of helpless reincarnations, make his so-called religion a beautiful dream that is never actualized in life. Indeed the land of its birth, has largely repudiated it, and Japan where it is now most largely domesticated, is turning towards the only virile, regenerative moral force—Christianity. Life comes only through life. The redemptive force of our religion springs from the Christ of All Days. It is not too much to claim that historically, His is the only name given under heaven whereby men can be saved.

Rescue, by suppression of sin, is after all but the lower side of the redemptive work of Jesus. His own characteristic ut-

terance was, "I am come that ye might have life and that ye might have it in abundance." When the St. Paul's huge, black bulk lay stranded on the bar off Long-Branch, men cheered every effort of steam tug and her own engines to drag her into the open sea. Her rescue from imminent destruction was the first consideration. When at last, with the help of the uplifting, storm swelled tide, she floated clear and erect on the safe bosom of the sea, a mighty shout of joy and congratulation went up to heaven. But the St. Paul was not yet at her best. Not until reladened with her freight of merchandise and human life; not until her engines throbbed and she plunged eastward across the tempestuous Atlantic, carrying a myriad blessings and hopes to distant shores, was she truly saved — saved for service. Let this incident illustate the truth in hand.

The rescue of a soul from sin is great, but the enrichment and satisfaction of that soul, by the inpouring life of Jesus, is a still richer experience and fact. Just here, it seems to me, many teachers of our religion have gone astray. Their Christianity has been one of repression and asceticism. To crush out sin is a partial truth. To grow in grace and in a knowledge of our Lord is the truer, endless, development into which we are called. The one is a negative cutting off of egoism, the other, is a conserving, directing, enrichment of the basal forces of life. To transform these animal forces into spiritual forces; to give higher efficiency and nobler purpose to what life we have; to carry us, with the full momentum of an abounding life, to our ordained goal, these are the higher gifts of His transmitted life. It is Christ taking the small and insignificant things of life and touching them with His own divine being, thus making them potent for the feeding of the multitude, that make His influence the supreme spiritual power of history. It is His awakening touch of the dormant spiritual life of men, this feeding and inspiring for the most heroic deeds of all time, that perpetuates His claim to be the man of all days.

Reluctantly must I leave this important but crude statement of His work, and view, for a moment, the future, the vision which he has set for our encouragement.

HIS VISION.

The universalism of Jesus is not an accidental note in His program. It was clearly contemplated in those last great days of the apostolic commission, "Go ye into all the world make disciples of all nations." Though born a Jew, and inheriting the Hebrew traditions of nationality and religion, His vision swept far beyond His people and leaped the ceremonial barriers erected by every national cult. Fairbairn has said, "The belief in a person who was equally related to all men involved the notion that the men who were so related to Him were equally related to each other; and the other conception that he had died to redeem all, make all appear of equal value in his sight and of equal worth before God, who indeed as the God of Jesus Christ could know no respect of person. For in Christ there was neither Jew nor Greek, bond or free, but only one new man." Thus Jesus furnishes the most comprehensive and intensive of all world programs. For a clearer appreciation of this universalism of Jesus we have but to recall the limited view and provision made by the ethnic religions of antiquity. Each nation had its own God or gods, limited in control to the tribe, and circumscribed in time by the national existence. "Whether we turn to the Greeks in the west, or to the Assyrians in the east, we find that religion was not so much a matter of soul as of soil. There could be no religion without a country, and citizenship was indissolubly bound up with loyalty to the God or gods presiding over a district. To the Romans, after the fall of Jerusalem, both Jews and Christians appeared as "without God"—atheists. But Christ knew no national boundaries for His religion. He instituted no rites which contracted his discipleship into a tribe. Nothing short of humanity itself was the limit of His vision. Out of every nation, those who received Him could enter his kingdom. Without distinction of caste, color, condition or race all were bidden to the feast of divine sonship and communion. The marvel still grows, as we contemplate the fact that all occupations, all service, all human activities were to be swept within the circle of religion. Life itself was the sacred thing. No one class, or no one vocation was to be called holy

but all noble service was to receive the seal of His approving spirit. Nor were the different social and political institutions to be left without the pale of religion. The family and the state were to be permeated by the same spirit, and fashioned by the same law as the Church. Nothing human was to escape the gentle sway of His divine law. Education, music, art, industry, science, trade, literature—all human relations were to be brought beneath the spell of His harmonious life. He has set an ideal before the race which it feels bound to realize, though it may step with slow and labored reluctance.

I have said that His religion was the most intensive of all other moral schemes presented for man's betterment. It is the most intensive because it gets its creative and propulsive power from something deeper than the intellect and the moral law. It finds its controlling and creative principle in the heart of God. God is holy love. This is its profoundest definition of God. This is its supreme gift to man. Love is the creative and all comprehending principle of his religion. Obedience to Allah is the highest, and commanding motive for the Mohammedan. A humble reverence for Jehovah was the nearest approach antiquity offered to the full and free communion of the individual soul with God. Not until Jesus disclosed the eternal motive and heart of God, did the universal and intense love of God bring men into perfect communion with Himself. It was because of this universal love of God for humanity, that Jesus declared His faith in the final good for all mankind.

> "One God, one law, one element
> And one far off divine event
> To which the whole creation moves."

The result of this faith and love is the brotherhood of man in Christ Jesus. Already, it is building our hospitals and homes for the aged and the broken wrecks of the streets; already, it makes the rich Dives of our modern Jerusalem restless at his sumptuous table; already, it has asserted the civil equality of all men; already, it has made war among kindred peoples fratricidal; already, it has banded the sons of toil in near and distant lands for a common defence and improvement; already, it has broken racial barriers and opened hermit nations; already, the

lowest classes socially have been swept within the consideration of the social élite; already, we talk of Anglo-Saxon federation and world-wide parliaments for the peace of the earth. What else is to come, through His benign leadership, who can tell? What Christ was, the ideal man, that humanity is becoming. "His words sought their audience a thousand or two thousand years ahead." After Renan had done his worst, in the pitiless criticism of Christ, he closes his *Life of Jesus* with this testimony—"Whatever may be the unexpected phenomena of the future, Jesus will never be surpassed. His worship will unceasingly renew its youth; his legends will be the source of endless tears; the best of hearts will be melted by his sufferings; all the ages will proclaim that among the sons of men there has not been born one greater than Jesus." He is taking His rightful place. Still we must sing with the wild bells of Tennyson:

"Ring out the grief that saps the mind
For those that here we seek no more;
Ring out the feud of rich and poor,
Ring in redress to all mankind.

Ring out a slowly dying cause,
And ancient forms of party strife;
Ring in the nobler modes of life,
With sweeter manners, purer laws.

Ring in the valiant man and free,
The larger heart, the kindlier hand;
Ring out the darkness of the land,
Ring in THE CHRIST THAT IS TO BE."

ARTICLE IX.

SKETCH OF REV. ELIJAH HAWKINS.

By J. A. Brown, D. D.

Rev. Elijah Hawkins is justly entitled to a place in our series of ministerial sketches. It would be an act of injustice to the Church did we fail to rescue from oblivion the memory of one so greatly honored and so universally esteemed.

He was born March 3d, 1811, in Newberry District, S. C., and died at his home in Smyth Co., Va., March 5th, 1868. Aged, 57 years and two days.

Of his early history we have very little knowledge. We learn, however, that his parents were very devoted Christians, and that when Elijah was born and his twin brother died, his mother prayed fervently that God would spare his life that she might dedicate him to the Gospel ministry. Her prayer was answered, and when quite young he commenced preparation for this great work. He graduated with distinction at the Theological Seminary at Lexington, S. C., under the tuition of Dr. Hazelius. Soon after his graduation he was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Synod of South Carolina, and came to Virginia more as a missionary than in answer to any special call from congregations. He commenced his labors in Smyth and Washington counties in the year 1836, was ordained in Zion's Church, Wythe county, Va., in May, 1838, by the North Carolina Synod which at that time embraced all the churches in south-west Virginia. He spent the whole of his ministerial life of about thirty years in Smyth and adjoining counties. When he commenced his labors here there were only two other Lutheran ministers (Revs. J. Scherer and J. J. Gruver) who occupied this entire field, each of them serving four or five congregations. Besides the great distances they had to travel over hills and mountains, the roads were sometimes almost impassable. There were no railroads or even turnpikes yet in existence here. All these inconveniences had to be met, but like good soldiers of the cross they went

forth in the name of their Master, and by their great labors and self-denials planted the churches we now occupy.

In the year, 1842, the Synod of South-west Virginia was organized. Rev. Hawkins was one of its founders and its first secretary, and until the year of his death was ever regarded as one of its leading spirits. As an evidence of his punctuality and interest in all our church work, we learn from the ministers of synod that during his long connection with this body he was in attendance at every annual meeting with one exception, and for many years occupied some official position in synod.

To say that Bro. Hawkins was a good man is not enough. To say simply that he was faithful in the discharge of his ministerial duties is not enough. It does not express his real character. He was one of the most efficient men we have ever had amongst us, laboring with untiring zeal in season and out of season. Though always feeble in body, yet through the parching heat of summer and the winds and snows of winter, he would plod his way over these hills and mountains to meet his appointments and deliver his Master's message. His faithfulness and punctuality always secured for him good congregations. No one thought of being disappointed if it were possible for Bro. Hawkins to meet his engagements.

There was something very beautiful and attractive in his private character. His heart was as warm as a child's, as kind as a woman's, and as true as steel. His countenance was an index of his heart, open and generous and pure. He was an "Israelite indeed in whom was no guile, one of Christ's beloved disciples." He had no talent for intrigue and never connived at what he knew to be wrong. In all his intercourse with men he exhibited that childlike simplicity which is always characteristic of a pure heart, utterly incapable of an intentional wrong.

As a preacher, Mr. Hawkins was remarkably gifted. He was always prepared for any emergency. He made no pretensions to eloquence in the popular sense of that term, but was always prepared to present the plain, simple truths of the Gospel in such a way as to command the attention of all who heard him, having no disposition to discuss matters of minor importance. Mere ceremonials or peculiar modes of worship received

but little sympathy from him. But the great questions connected with our duty in this life and our destiny in the life to come were always uppermost in his mind and the themes of his discourses. "Am I living for Christ?" "Do I believe in his name?" "Am I discharging my whole duty in trying to bring sinners to Jesus?" Such questions always interested him.

I have already stated that Mr. Hawkins was remarkably gifted as an extemporaneous speaker. All his performances were extemporaneous. He never wrote his sermons—never used notes even. And to my certain knowledge he could prepare a well arranged systematic discourse in a few hours, and it is well known that he seldom made any preparation until the morning of the day when he was to preach He once assisted me on a sacramental occasion. He came to my house on Saturday. We passed the evening in social conversation. On Sabbath morning he asked, "What subject do you wish me to use to-day —please suggest something." I referred to my scrap-book and read several skeletons which were prepared when at the theological seminary. One of these seemed to please him, and from it he gave us a very creditable and edifying sermon. In fact his sermons were always edifying and instructive. He seemed to understand by intuition the character of his people and know how to adapt himself to their wants. Hence his churches were always in a growing condition spiritually and numerically. He was a strong advocate of genuine revivals of religion, and some of his churches were almost in a constant state of revival.

Mr. Hawkins exerted great influence over the members of synod as well as over the people of his charge. But it was rather a silent influence. He seldom participated in the discussions of Synod. A few words from him were sufficient. In fact there were few theological combats to be fought in those days; no dogmas to attack or defend. It was sin and Satan and the powers of darkness that had to be met, and faithfully did he and his ministerial associates meet them. As an evidence of his influence and the confidence his people had in him the following incident may be mentioned. Many years ago there was a general rebellion amongst the students of Roanoke College. The exercises were entirely suspended. Nearly all

the students had arrayed themselves against the authorities of the institution, demanding redress for supposed wrongs which they had received. The whole Lutheran Church throughout the state was agitated and the very existence of the college was threatened. A meeting of the Board of Trustees, of which Mr. Hawkins was a member, was called to reconcile existing difficulties. When his people learned that their pastor was going to the meeting of the Board they were quite satisfied, believing that he would make all right.

Having a well disciplined mind and a thorough theological education, Mr. Hawkins was qualified for almost any position in the church. He received several calls to professorships in colleges all of which he declined. He seemed to have no higher aspiration than that of a country pastor. His reply to these calls was, "I am called to preach the Gospel, not to teach." This he regarded as his great life-work. And this he continued to do faithfully and earnestly until a short time before his death.

In his physical structure, Mr. Hawkins had an exceedingly cadaverous appearance, so lean and lank and slender that during the last years of his life he was reduced to a mere shadow, perhaps not weighing more than one hundred pounds. At his last appointment, which was at Kimberlin, he was so feeble that he could scarcely reach his home, having to stop and rest several times on his way.

The closing scenes of his life were truly affecting. A few days before his death he called his family to his bed-side. To his children he said, "Don't lose your souls for the trifling things of earth," and then asked them to sing "Gently, Lord, O gently lead us," he saying, "My sentiments and hope of heaven are expressed in that hymn better than I can tell you for want of strength." Then turning to his weeping companion he said, "We have worshiped God together for a long time: keep on, don't grow weary in well doing, we will soon meet again." A few moments before he breathed his last, embracing his wife, he exclaimed, "I'm over safe and dry, meet me there. How beautiful! How beautiful!" When asked what it was, he replied, "I can't tell you. Good bye!" and expired.

Thus after a long life of usefulness, his work completed—

surrounded by his family—his mind calm—his faith strong—his hopes bright—this good man fell asleep in Jesus. And even after death had done its work that placid smile so peculiar to him still lighted up his countenance and spoke of the happiness he was no doubt then enjoying. Well may we exclaim if this be the way the Christian can die, "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his."

The services connected with his burial are still fresh in the memory of many, and the tears shed on that occasion were an appropriate testimony to his exalted worth. He was carried to the little graveyard near the church he loved so well at Pleasant Hill. Short addresses were delivered by Revs. L. A. Mann, A. Phillippi, E. H. McDonald and the writer of this sketch. Here he sleeps his last sleep, guarded not only by God's ministering angels, but by the everlasting mountains that stand around him on every side. He approached his grave "like one who wraps the drapery of his couch about him and lies down to pleasant dreams."

Long years will pass away before the beloved memory and blessed labors of Elijah Hawkins will be forgotten. He leaves to his family, his friends and the church a record of which all may be proud. Amid all the conflicts of his eventful life not a blemish ever sullied his character. Not a stain tarnished his fair name he has left behind him. Never perhaps in the memory of the present generation has one fallen among us so universally esteemed.

"Servant of God, well done.
Rest from thy loved employ.
The battle fought, the victory won,
Enter thy Master's joy."

ARTICLE X.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

IMPORTED BY CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

History of Egypt. The XVIIth and XVIII Dynasties. By W. M. Flinders Petrie. Vol. II. pp. 340. Price $2.25.

We will soon be as familiar with the history of Egypt as we are with that of England. Prof. Petrie, who stands at the head of the eminent specialists, is peculiarly qualified for the task he has undertaken by reason of his long residence in Egypt and his fruitful discoveries while excavating its ruins. The volume before us, the second in a series of seven, gives an account of the continued efforts of the Egyptian princes to throw off the yoke of the Hyksos, and their final success under the victorious Aahmes, the founder of the XVIIIth dynasty. The monuments, which have been silent for so many ages, are here made to speak and to reveal the life story of the successive rulers of this dynasty, their military campaigns and great battles, their triumphs in peace and their achievements in building temples and tombs. We have full descriptions of the reigns of Hatshepsu, the Queen Bess of Egypt, of Tehutimes III, the Alexander the Great and of Akhenaten the heretic. A number of explanatory notes, a chapter on the mummies found at Deir el Bahri and a copious index complete the volume. The whole is a work of great research, and will be authoritative on Egyptian history. We await with impatience the appearance of the next volume. T. C. B.

The Expository Times. Edited by Rev. James Hastings, A. M. Vol. VII. October 1895—September 1896. 4to. pp. 568. $2.50 net.

It is a great satisfaction to the reviewer to have the bound copy of another volume of this standard periodical. With contributions from the foremost Biblical scholars of Great Britain on a wide diversity of scriptural and ecclesiastical subjects, and with its candid and searching reviews of recent theological literature, its twelve monthly issues constitute a volume of permanent value, to be placed at a convenient part of the library. It is an enrichment to any library, and clergymen of studious habits are to be commiserated if they are not subscribers to the wide-awake and solid monthly. E. J. W.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

Life and Times of Girolamo Savonarola, by Professor Pasquale Villari. With portraits and Illustrations. pp. 792. $2.50.

The bringing out of a popular edition of the English translation of

this well-known and principal work on the immortal Italian Reformer, will be appreciated, we doubt not, by a large body of readers. To all students of religious history Savonarola continuues to be a subject of perennial and inexhaustible interest. A Reformer before the Reformation, what proofs he offers both of the deplorable corruption of the Roman hierarchy, and of the impotence of all efforts at reform not aimed at the core of this corruption, the false doctrines which prevailed! In the clear recognition and open confession of the abounding disorder, as well as in his defiance of the Pope, Savonarola may be indeed regarded as a precursor of Luther, but the Friar who publicly declared that "he desired to make no changes of dogma," thereby showed himself lacking the first requiste for the purification of God's House. On the other hand in his combination of political with religious reform, in his preaching of the most vigorous morality, and in his invectives against amusements and his "burning of the vanities" on the last day of the Carnival, he showed himself the true prototype of Calvin, and many pages of Florentine history during Savonarola's ascendency read like a chapter of Geneva when John Calvin held ecclesiastical and secular sway in that city.

The English of this edition is so idiomatic and flowing that the reader is never reminded that it is a translation, except by a few original excerpts from the Friar's writings, especially his poetry. It is a work which commends itself to all lovers of a literature which blends charming style with solid instruction. E. J. W.

God the Creator and Lord of All. By Samuel Harris, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Yale University. Two volumes. pp. 579, 576. Price, $5.00.

These two fine volumes are of superior excellence. No one will read far in them without realizing that they have been written by a master. They virtually cover Dr. Harris' scheme of systematic theology including also, as an outgrowth, his system of Christian ethics. He begins by defining theology as "the intellectual apprehension and expression of what God really is in his relation to the universe, and especially to man, and of what man and the universe are in their relation to God," and shows the importance of theology as the intellectual element in religion. After clearing away some current misconceptions about theology, he argues that theological investigation accords with the spirit and teaching of the Bible; that it is essential to the preservation and purity of Christian belief and also of Christian character and life; that it is necessary to the effective preaching of the Gospel; and that theology should be studied in reference to the questions of the day.

After this fine introductory chapter, preparing one well for what follows, he enters upon the discussion of the doctrines treated. Beginning with "God the Absolute Spirit" he reasons with clear definitions and logic in support of his propositions and meets with just as clear-

cut argument some prevalent misconceptions of God's revelation of himself, in his word, as the Absolute Spirit. He goes on then with the attributes of God as the Absolute Being—his self-existence, omnipresence, eternity, etc.; his essential attributes of reason, free will and feeling as Spirit; his benevolence to man and his love in redemption; the doctrine of the Trinity; the Person of Christ; the Atonement. Part II treats of God the Creator; III, God the Lord of All in Providential Government; IV, God the Lord of All in Moral Government.

There is careful reasoning here and philosophical argument all through. And some may think it is as dull as it is logical, that the very nature of the general subject implies this. The dullness, however, is relieved by happy illustrations and interesting notes and the constant application, especially under IV, to the current thought and the needs of men to-day. This is one of the special merits of this meritorious work.

There is something lacking, however, in the discussion on the Person of Christ, and the doctrines of Baptism and the Lord's Supper receive very scant attention. On the subject of free will Dr. Harris writes much like a Lutheran, but on the Person of Christ his theology is of the distinctively Reformed type. But where there is so much to commend we refrain from taking further exception. The work may receive attention hereafter in a formal article.

Europe in the Middle Age. By Oliver J. Thatcher, Ph. D., and Ferdinand Schwill, Ph. D. With Maps and Charts. pp. 681. Price, $2.00.

This is intended as a text-book for the use of the freshman and sophomore classes in our colleges. For this reason the authors felt less unrestrained than if there had been no such definite purpose in view during its preparation. We are not lacking in literature on this period, and yet there is a place for this book, for no other will serve so well as a text-book for the college student. Hallam was the reader's chief hand-book for many years but his work has now been superseded by others—chiefly by those of Emerton, Adams, Bryce, Lavisse and Rambaud (10 volumes), and Symonds (Renaissance in Italy, 6 volumes). Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire still holds its high place. But these are for the student's general reading rather than for the class-room.

The authors speak of using the topical arrangement because of the conditions and limitations they were under in preparing the work as a text-book. No apology is necessary on this point. It is an excellent feature, and will likely please the general reader as well as meet the wants of the student in college. The interest varies, but every chapter gives satisfaction. We speak with special satisfaction of the ones on the Migration of the Nations, the Dismemberment of the Empire, Feudalism, the Growth of the Papacy, Monasticism, the Civilization of the Middle Age, and the Italian Renaissance. But why discriminate

where all are so good. The authors have succeeded in their purpose to prepare a text-book, and more: they have furnished for the public an excellent book for reading.

Jesus Christ Before His Ministry. By Edmund Stapfer, Professor in the Faculty of Protestant Theology in Paris. Translated by Louise Seymour Houghton. pp. 182. Price, $1.25.

This will be followed by two more volumes, the one on "Jesus Christ during His Ministry" and the other on "The Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ." In the present one the author clearly reveals the standpoint from which he views the person and work of Christ. While reverent and sympathetic, presenting the Master as the wonder of his age, he ascribes to him nothing beyond the human in his birth or character. He says himself (p. 164): "We believe that it was the inward development of his moral consciousness which led Jesus to declare himself the Saviour of the world." In his view-point he differs from Strauss and Renan but he makes Jesus no more super-human than they. The devout believer will not accept his views though he will confess that they are most plausibly presented and that the book makes most fascinating reading. How he will explain the miracles we are curious to see. The work has been translated into excellent idiomatic English.

The Power of Thought. What it is and what it does. By John Douglas Sterrett. With an Introduction by J. Mark Baldwin, Professor of Psychology in Princeton University. pp. 320. Price, $1.75.

It is not an easy thing to discuss psychological subjects without the technical terms of that science, but Mr. Sterrett has, in large measure, accomplished this task. Professional psychologists will likely take issue with him on not a few points treated here in familiar and popular language, but would not the same likely be the result with works issued by members of their own special class? Professor Baldwin, in somewhat guarded terms, commends this book as having the two merits of being interesting and at the same time free from the fault of weakening science by treating it in language familiar to the popular mind. He thinks, too, it will be found "trustworthy by the general reader, and also available by teachers in search of a text-book in the elements of psychology." We are inclined to accept his judgment, though we think that he, in giving this commendation, leaned a little more to the promptings of a generous heart than to the judgment of a cool head.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

Baptism and Feet-washing. By Rev. P. Bergstresser, D. D. pp. 232. Price, $1.00.

Here we have the finished product of a discussion held in 1879 by the author with a leading representative of a sect which holds to immersion as the only proper mode of baptism and to feet-washing as a sacrament.

Dr. Bergstresser came out of that discussion as the acknowledge victor and with his reputation as a theological debater much enhanced. Two thousand copies of the debate, in large pamphlet, were printed and sold; and the calls for more, along with the suggestion from influential men that he publish his argument in book-form, have led him to prepare this volume. It is a revised and enlarged treatment of the subject in three parts—the mode of baptism, the subjects of baptism, and feet-washing.

All who are acquainted with Dr. Bergstresser know of his careful and painstaking methods as a writer. With these methods, he applied to his task his powers as a cool debater and his exceptional and enviable familiarity with the word of God. From the armory of the Scriptures he fortifies every position taken and in the completed work renders himself impregnable. Whatever heat of debate is left does not mar at all the solid reasoning of the discussion but rather adds life to the book and makes it all the more readable. It is a book for the layman as well as the preacher, the author's style being marked by a clearness and directness of statement that render his thought easily intelligible without detracting from the strength of the argument.

It is but just to add also that this volume is a credit to its publishers as well as to its author, and its merits, in mechanical make-up and contents, along with the reasonable price, should secure for it a ready sale.

Life Reminiscences of an Old Lutheran Minister. By John G. Morris, D. D. pp. 396. Price, $1.25.

To any one who knew Dr. Morris either personally or through his writings, there will be no question as to the authenticity of these life reminiscences. In them will be found the same familiar and entertaining style that appeared in his communications to the press—the same, too, that appeared in his conversations in the social circle and made him so companionable. He wrote just as he talked, whether recording facts, relating an incident, telling a story, or giving his opinion of any plan, enterprise, institution, book or man. It is Dr. Morris all through, and the reader who takes up the book will want to do as we did—read it from cover to cover before laying it aside.

Dr. Morris was born in 1803. He entered upon his ministry in the days of small things in the Lutheran Church, lived through its struggles and strifes for nearly three-fourths of a century, watched its progress with the keenest interest, and felt a gratification over the strength and influence it has attained in these last years second to none within its bounds. He had a special reason for this gratification in the fact that he himself was an important factor in many of the enterprises that specially contributed to its growth. In some of them, indeed, he was the originator. He became an active adherent of the General Synod soon after its organization. He attended its meetings when its mem-

bership counted less than a score, and was a delegate at its last convention when its roll numbered many scores, sent by the unanimous vote of the Maryland Synod as the head of its delegation of sixteen. Unswerving in his devotion to the General Synod, he also had a warm place in his heart for his Lutheran brethren of the other general bodies, and was in turn highly esteemed by them.

In authorship he treated of themes chiefly theological, historical and scientific. He wrote many books and magazine articles, and his newspaper communications would fill volumes. He was a member of a number of historical and scientific societies, and the esteem in which he was held is attested by the resolutions passed by these societies at the time of his death. In reading these reminiscences we are more than ever impressed with the many-sidedness of Dr. Morris and the high degree of excellence he attained on these many sides. Get the book. You will read it through, if you once begin.

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE COMPANY, NEW YORK.

Annotations on the Gospel According to St. Luke. By H. Louis Baugher, D. D. pp. 451.

Dr. Baugher has special qualifications as an expositor of the Bible, especially of the New Testament. He is a proficient Greek scholar, loves the word and has implicit faith in it, is fond of Bible study, and expresses himself in clear and vigorous language. With these qualifications his attainments as a theologian raise the expectation of a good commentary on the book assigned him by the editor of this series. This expectation has been met by these annotations on the Gospel according to St. Luke. The scholar is lost in the earnest Bible student, and the sub-title of the Lutheran Commentary as "a plain exposition of the Holy Scriptures of the New Testament," is here successfully met, and that, too, without weakening it.

As part of a series bearing the title, "The Lutheran Commentary," the book properly has a Lutheran trend in its interpretation of Scripture whose meaning has been viewed in a different light by the respective churches. We would expect the same principle to hold in a Presbyterian or Baptist commentary, as in fact we do find in the case of the American Commentary issued by the Baptist Publication Society. And yet there is no going out of his way by the author to make the denominational feature conspicuous. Wherever it appears it is not obtruded but comes in naturally.

Like some others of the series, thus far issued, this is mainly a verse by verse commentary. It will meet the wants of the Sunday-school teacher as well as the preacher, and prove a valuable addition to Lutheran literature.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY, BOSTON.

Christianity and Social Problems. By Lyman Abbott. pp. 370. Price, $1.25.

It is refreshing to take up a book of this kind. Especially refreshing is it after reading or hearing the many unsatisfying and, in many cases, unreasonable solutions of our social problems as given in to-day's books and magazines or from the lecture platform. The author shows that Christ had a mission to society as well as to the individual, and that his methods and principles, if followed, would give us the brotherhood among men for which we long and pray. The distinctive socialist would raise up the degraded by giving them better food and cleaner clothes, better streets and dwellings, by introducing industrial and other schools, but is usually silent as to their moral and spiritual needs, indeed in many instances he is even opposed to the divine institution that aims to give the moral and spiritual uplift. But Christ's method was different. To quote from Dr. Abbott, "he did not begin with the bottom of man and work up to the top: he began at the top and worked down toward the bottom. He did not attempt to lift man up by a leverage applied from below; he attempted to lift them up by a hand reached down from above" (p. 135). The socialist would improve man by improving his environment; Christ, by improving his character. This can be taken as the basis or general trend of treatment in all the thirteen chapters. On every page there is a full appreciation of the worth of man as man, and yet, throughout all its pages, there is nothing of the demagogic spirit that would array the so-called lower classes against the higher.

Some books on Socialism may be read with profit by the employer; a few may be read without harm by the employee; but this can be read with marked profit by both employer and employee, capitalist and laborer, by all indeed who seek to lift up or be lifted up without pulling others down.

Chapters from a Life. By Elizabeth Stuart Phelps.

It was with great gratification that the many admirers and friends of Elizabeth Stuart Phelps received the announcement that they were to have her autobiography. Strong influence was brought to bear upon her, and she was finally persuaded to lay aside a life-long determination not to write of her own life and experience in this manner; and all her readers, but more especially the readers whom she has more closely attached to herself through the not-to-be-forgotten story of A Singular Life, are charmed with the result. She has written in a style so thoroughly pleasing that the remark of one reader has been, "If we were to have many such autobiographies, fiction would lose its charm." Much of interest has been connected with the writer's life. Born and reared in Andover, she was associated in her own family and outside of

it with many of the great minds of the century. Many of the most vexed and vexing theological questions have excited and disturbed the atmosphere in which she found her existence, and they left their impressions upon her which she here gives to her readers, and they are rejoiced to find her own faith unshaken, sweet and simple as a child's. She has been contemporaneous with and has had for her personal friends many of the most brilliant lights of this period, among them Mrs. Stowe, Longfellow, Whittier, Holmes, James T. Fields, Lucy Larcom, Phillips Brooks, Celia Thaxter and many others, and of these she gives such personal glimpses as are truly delightful. But we have enjoyed most the glimpses she has here given us of her own life, of its joys and sorrows, its struggles and successes, its fears and surprises, and of its loneliness and companionships. Perhaps it is the way of telling it (for never has Mrs. Ward wielded her pen more gracefully) that makes her life-story so pleasing, but we think that very much more of interest than is usual has attached itself to the life of this writer who has succeeded in a rare manner in making her readers her friends. Of the great love that has come into her life she has written most delicately. A number of excellent illustrations, chief among them a fine likeness of the writer, are among the many charms of this delightful book.

Marm Lisa. By Kate Douglas Wiggin.

Mrs. Wiggin's connection with Kindergarten work and her love for little children coupled with a keen discernment of their nature and disposition has enabled her to write many beautiful sketches of child-life. She has revealed in all of these such an appreciation of the sorrows of childhood, its pathos and humor, its great craving for love and sympathy as has touched many hearts, and attached to herself many who have honored her for this womanly characteristic. Rarely does any one possess in common such sympathy with sorrow and such a keen sense of humor as does Mrs. Wiggin, and, perhaps, nowhere does she display this two-fold power more than in this new story. "Mrs. Grubb" is delineated in manner entirely irresistible, and her connection with the manifold organizations of the day is given in a style that not only entertains and amuses but does not fail to point a moral. "Mistress Mary" is a character of remarkable sweetness and purity whose philosophizing on Christmas alone would make the book worth reading, a character which in many things may well prove an example. The children of the story are unique, while "Marm Lisa" awakens the sympathy of the reader until it becomes almost painful. Characters more diverse, more consistently drawn and sustained than these, it would be difficult to find and there are many lessons of the beauty of service for others taught here in such a forceful manner that they must almost of necessity be learned.

The Poems of Celia Thaxter.

Sarah Orne Jewett has prefaced this collection of Mrs. Thaxter's poems with a just and beautiful estimate of her character and work and it is a fit prelude to the songs that follow it. Truly they are songs, and they breathe the deepest feelings of that great heart which learned for itself Life's fullest meanings. To her came her portion of sorrow and of torturing doubts, but the light followed and out of a life full of the heart's richest treasures she wrote. Very many of these poems breathe of the sea and we find scattered all through them the lessons learned from its weeds, its breakers, its tides, its crafts, its wrecks and its graves. Mrs. Thaxter loved nature; its birds and flowers, its sunrises and sunsets were much to her and of these she sings in sweetest strains. And she loved and valued her friends, and she has penned poems that are rare tributes to the worth of those friends. Music and art, too, claimed a large share of her attention and to these she pays her homage in most perfect verse. Of the sentiments that are hers she has written most freely, and in Sorrow, Courage, Remembrance, Wherefore, Alone, Philosophy, and many others she has given us glimpses into what Mrs. Ward has been pleased to call "her luxurious heart." These poems are so fresh, so pure, so elevating that they deserve to find a place in every library.

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY PRESS, CHICAGO.

Origin and Development of the Nicene Theology, with some reference to the Ritchlian view of Theology and History of Doctrine. By Hugh M. Scott, D. D. 8vo. pp. 390.

This volume by the learned Chicago theologian contains a course of Six Lectures delivered on the L. P. Stone Foundation at Princeton Theological Seminary, in January, 1896. They present the Nicene theology in its genesis and growth "as it sets forth or shadows the Person and work of the Divine Christ." The point of view from which they were prepared is the question, "What think ye of Christ," the testing inquiry to be put to all doctrines as well as to all men. The objective point is, however, the Ritchlian position, "the agnostic, positivistic, temper, which attacks the most precious doctrines of Christianity as essentially pagan." It is, we think, the first attempt in English to outline the growth of the Nicene theology with any real reference to this destructive critical school.

It does not come a moment too soon. And for this breakwater against the incoming tide of error a great debt is due to the enterprise of Princeton and to the author's prodigious research, his ample familiarity with the subject, and his clear apprehension of the danger to American religious circles from the approach of this "undogmatic Christianity." On the latter point a sentence or two from the preface shows by what manner of spirit the work is characterized: "The ap-

peals 'Back to Christ,' the claim to represent 'the historic Christ,' the play upon 'the consciousness of Christ' * * are often an 'Open sesame' for these foreign teachings. Then the new science of 'Christian Sociology,' which makes the Church institutional, and emphasizes 'environment' as well as 'heredity,' by its teachings about the kingdom of God, prepares the way for Ritchl's theology of Christ and the Church."

The conclusion of the author, so ably and so cogently maintained as to make it the conclusion of his readers, is that our Lord is not "a product of Hellenism," that the Nicene doctrine is not a Hellenistic modification of a faith which in its original form was widely different, but a normal development from primitive Christian truths, not indeed unaffected by both Hellenism and Judaism as divinely ordained factors.

It would be too much to claim that Prof. Foster is always absolutely fair to the teachers he criticises, that he is not chargeable with overstatement of their theories and with drawing conclusions which they themselves would repudiate, but he impresses you with his desire to be just and discriminating, and he gives abundant evidence of having carefully sought to learn the truth from leading representatives of all the great German schools.

Prepared especially for students of divinity and for studious ministers, it is a work deserving the widest diffusion in those circles.

E. J. W.

LEA BROTHERS AND COMPANY, PHILADELPHIA.

A History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church, by Henry Charles Lea, LL. D. Three vols, 8vo., pp. 523, 514, 629.

We owe our readers as well as the publishers an apology for not having in this issue a full notice of this great work, which a competent critic pronounces "in many respects the largest and most important historical work produced in this country during the last year."

The delay has been absolutely inevitable. Our next issue may be expected to present an ample review.

EATON AND MAINS, NEW YORK.

The Christian Democracy. A History of its Suppression and Revival. By John McDowell Leavitt, D. D., LL. D. pp. 391.

The subjects treated in this work cover a wide range. The author wields a graphic as well as a polemic pen, whose effusions will not always find universal assent. What he says on the democratic claim of church polity will be heartily endorsed by all who repudiate the hierarchical claim. According to this "the communion of believers, lay and clerical together, constitute the Christian Commonwealth. * * The sovereignty of the Church is in the whole body of the disciples who compose the Church. All power therefore flows not from ministers to people, but from people to ministers."

But when an author claims for the *Didache* the teaching that "Bap-

tism must be administered by pouring on the head in the name of the Trinity" he can hardly be called a safe historical guide.

After this bit of caricature intelligent readers will feel no surprise over the "spots," "infirmities" and "shadows" which the author discovers in Luther after the Diet at Worms. "He appears to have lost the joy and liberty which gave power to his early religious testimony. In the pulpit he did not seem to have that eloquence of the Spirit which had converted cities and kingdoms"—an allusion doubtless to Luther's series of sermons on fanaticism. "At the Castle of Marburg Luther played Pope with Zwingli, divided the Reformation, and created antagonisms which centuries have not buried"—certainly not in the bosom of Dr. Leavitt. "Petulantly he hurled James out of the Canon, and jocosely pronounced Paul napping in Galatians, thus unsettling the authority of Scripture, disturbing the very foundations," &c., &c.

A work abounding in similar passages touching Creeds, Liturgies, Councils, Protestantism, &c., affords great diversion to a tired brain.

E. J. W.

Torchbearers of Christendom. By Robert Remington Doherty. pp. 288.

This clever and quite readable little volume was written for young people and for others who love the Church but do not know much about it. Intended primarily for Epworth Leaguers, it is worthy of Lutheran Leaguers, and is suitable for Sunday School libraries and family reading in general. We notice a few slips such as the term "consubstantion" for the Lutheran doctrine of Christ's Real Presence, and the mention of Paul Gerhardt as one of the great hymn writers produced by Pietism. The want of historic thoroughness and accuracy is reflected in the statement: "This Church (the Lutheran) has never emphasized the doctrine of the presence of the Holy Spirit." Had the writer said, this church emphasizes the doctrine of the presence of the Holy Spirit, he would have spoken truly. The Lutheran Church claims that the Holy Spirit is present wherever the word is preached and wherever the sacraments are administered.

E. J. W.

The Social Law of Service. By Richard T. Ely, Ph. D., Professor in the University of Wisconsin. pp. 276. Price, 90 cents.

Much that we have said, on another page, in reference to Dr. Lyman Abbott's "Christianity and Social Problems," may with propriety be said of Prof. Ely's "Social Law of Service." The point of view is virtually the same, and hence also their arguments and conclusions. Christ's method of elevating our race is brought into view and emphasized. He shows, moreover, how this method applies in special cases and to the conflicting views and obligations that present themselves in our day. We read here the judgment of a cool-headed Christian Professor in a field of thought that he has cultivated long and well. As

Professor of Political Economy and Director of the School of Economics, Political Science, and History in the University of Wisconsin, his duties have naturally carried him along the kindred line of Social Science, and he has been exceptionally active in his investigations. He also had ample facilities at hand to pursue them. His eight or more published works all bear on this same general subject. In reading this book, therefore, one may feel that he is getting the views not of a sciolist but of a close and painstaking and earnest student. The book, indeed, is a growth, the summing up in a sense of the study of years, and hence the mature and well-considered conclusions of the writer. Its wide circulation would do incalculable good.

The World for Christ. By A. J. F. Behrends, D. D. pp. 167. Price, 90 cents.

An excellent contribution to missionary literature. We have here the 1896 series of addresses on missions, delivered at Syracuse University, New York, on the Graves foundation. After an earnest and reverent lecture on the authority to be recognized in conducting missionary work, Dr. Behrends shows, in vivid language, the field to be won, the result to be achieved, the resistance to be overcome, the leaders to be appointed, and the agencies to be employed.

We note as a matter of no little interest and significance also, that these addresses were delivered at a Methodist university by a Congregational minister on a foundation established by an honored member of the Reformed Church. May we not take this as an indication and some encouragement to hope that, even if there shall be no organic union of the churches at an early day on the basis of a common faith, there may be "interdenominational courtesy and fraternity in the prosecution of our common work" (p. 52); and that our Methodist brethren will soon change their policy of spending four or five times as much money on missions in Lutheran Scandinavia as they do in heathen Africa?

Illustrative Notes. A Guide to the Study of the International Sunday-school Lessons for 1897. By Jessie Lyman Hurlbut and Robert Remington Doherty. pp. 376. Price, $1.25.

The lessons for 1897 will be on the Acts of the Apostles, and here we have original and selected comments, suggestions on methods of teaching, illustrative stories, practical applications, notes on Eastern life, library references, maps, tables, pictures, diagrams, all of which the teacher will find very helpful to him in preparing for his Sunday-school work and in being helpful to his class. If any should wish to have anything in addition to the aids issued by his denominational publishing house, he will likely find in these illustrative notes just what he wants, in compact and systematic shape. It is true that this is from a denomtional house (the Methodist), but the discriminating teacher will know where to draw the line in the matter of helps when disputed points in doctrine arise.

Studies in the Acts of the Apostles. By B. B. Loomis, Ph. D., D. D. pp. 71. Price, 25 cents in paper; 40 cents in cloth.

Special attention will be given to the study of the Acts during 1897, especially by the Sunday-schools, and it is a happy coincidence that this little book has appeared just at this time. Any one who wishes to study this book of the New Testament systematically, will find here an excellent help. The suggestions on methods of study and of instruction, though covering but small space, are a valuable part of the book.

Three Old Maids in Hawaii. By Ellen Blackmar Maxwell.

Certainly a taking title. We suppose that readers who see it will be led to wonder who these old maids were, why they went to Hawaii and what they saw and did there; and if they suppose that the narrative of all this will be very interesting they will not be mistaken. It was no ordinary journey that these "old maids" took nor was it an ordinary motive that led them to take it. Indeed they were not ordinary maids but they were in many respects extraordinary. They were gifted with brightness and powers of observation very far above those of the usual traveler, as the reader of this book is sure to conclude, for he finds in it such distinct glimpses into the life of a people about whom so much interest has recently centered that he lays it aside with a genuine feeling of gratitude. A romance is woven into this account of travel which is not unwelcome. It is kept in the background and serves only to give added color and brightness to what is, in every particular, a delightful book.

In His Footsteps. By William E. McLennan.

This is an effort to awaken an interest in the earthly life of Christ. It was prepared, primarily, for the Epworth League of the M. E. Church but it is admirably adapted to the use of all Sunday-school teachers and young people's societies, without regard to denomination. The writer has the power of making very vivid his word pictures and those who read this book carefully will gain great help in their endeavors to make plain and attractive the chronological study of the Lord's journeyings. It is meant to be rather suggestive than exhaustive. Certainly it must prove itself of great value. It is only one of a series, to be called "The Footstep Series," so that those who have the benefit of these outlines will be on the lookout for those that are to come, and they will assuredly find that they will help "to make real the Christ of history."

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY, NEW YORK.

The Prophets of the Christian Faith. pp. 241. Price, $1.25.

After the question, What is a Prophet? is answered by Dr. Lyman Abbott, the ten names that answer to the title of the book are as follows: Isaiah, St. Paul, Clement of Alexandria, St. Augustine, John

Wycliffe, Martin Luther, John Wesley, Jonathan Edwards, Horace Bushnell, Frederick Denison Maurice. The papers on these have been prepared respectively by Drs. Francis Brown, George Matheson, Marcus Dods, Arthur C. McGiffert, W. H. Fremantle, Adolf Harnack, F. W. Farrar, A. M. Fairbairn, T. T. Munger, A. V. G. Allen. The book closes with a chapter by Dr. F. W. Farrar on Can We be Prophets?

The papers are comparatively brief but interesting. They are by authors in full sympathy with their subjects and exceedingly well written. It is doubtful, however, whether the selection of these ten as representative prophets of the Christian faith will meet the approval of one-tenth of a Christian jury well enough qualified to be in the full sense representative. The inclusion of at least two of them reveals the type of theology accepted by the man that made the selection, and this is manifested still more convincingly by the names of more than two of the writers chosen to prepare the papers. We confess that we are not quite "broad" enough to give assent to the choice in every case in either list.

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY, NEW YORK.

A Harmony of the Life of St. Paul, according to the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles. By Rev. Frank J. Goodwin. pp. 240. Price, $1.25.

Among the many works published to aid in systematic Bible study this Harmony of the Life of St. Paul deserves a prominent place. There is evidence in all its parts of careful and discriminating effort. Even the omissions, in order to avoid too great breaks in the story of the apostle's life, deserve commendation. They consist mainly of the dogmatic and ethical portions of his writings, and the story is thus saved from being lost in his theology. The seventeen sections of the Appendix are marked by a high grade of scholarship and constitute a valuable and exceedingly helpful part of the book. Good maps of St. Paul's missionary journeys and of his voyage to Rome are bound in with the text. Nothing, indeed, seems to have been omitted that will help one in the study of the life of this chief of the apostles.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO., NEW YORK.

Macaulay's Life of Samuel Johnson, together with his Essay on Johnson. Edited with notes and an introduction by Huber Gray Buehler, A. M., English Master at the Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn. pp. 110.

This belongs to the series of Longman's English Classics, under the general editorship of George R. Carpenter, A. B., Professor of Rhetoric and English Composition in Columbia College. "This series is designed for use in secondary schools in accordance with the system of study recommended and outlined by the National Committee of Ten, and in direct preparation for the uniform entrance requirements in En-

glish, now adopted by the principal American colleges and universities." Besides Macaulay's Life of Samuel Johnson there are three others prescribed for the 1897 examinations: Shakespeare's Merchant of Venice, Burke's Speech on Conciliation with America, and Scott's Marmion—each with introduction and notes by a special editor. The examination questions are prepared by the general editor.

The introduction and notes by Professor Buehler in this volume are of exceptional merit. The introduction, besides being a model of clearness in style, is well calculated to whet the intellectual appetite for Macaulay's biography and essay. The notes are just what the young student needs by way of help, and possess besides the unusual merit (for mere notes) of being interesting. There is manifest here a full appreciation of what will be most helpful to the student and a rare aptness for meeting those needs—characteristics that mark the born teacher.

THOMAS Y. CROWELL AND COMPANY, 46 EAST 14TH ST., NEW YORK.

Culture and Reform. By Anna Robertson Brown, Ph. D. pp. 32.

In this essay the author strikes the true principle of reform in a sentence on page 19: "The first thing, O child of man, is to put this restless, angered, weary will of thine in harmony with the divine will." She would not have reform work from without inward but from within outward—not mere environment first but character. Culture can then come in as an excellent handmaid of such reform. Her views are put in a striking but somewhat nervous style of expression—short, abrupt, but forceful sentences—giving the seed-thought rather, and letting the reader develop it to its natural conclusion.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT AND COMPANY, PHILADELPHIA.

Myths and Legends of Our Own Land. By Charles M. Skinner.

A feeling of pride will well up in the heart of the American student of folk-lore when he discovers that already his own country is so rich in legend. It has been supposed that only older countries had a folk-lore worth preserving and the writer claims that picturesque and lovely scenery in our own land has been unfavorably compared with that of other lands, not because it was lacking in loveliness but because it did not possess the "glamour that history and fable have flung" around the localities of older countries. Enough legends that are full of all the charm which only legends can have, have been gathered to fill two volumes. The bibliography of American legends is small and these have been gathered from many sources—from newspapers, magazines, histories, records and oral narrative. The search has been a long one and we think this is in great measure a complete collection. The legends have been arranged in the following groups: The Hudson and its Hills; The Isle of Manhattoes and Nearby; On and Near the Delaware; Tales of Puritan Land; Lights and Shadows of the South; The Central States and

Great Lakes; Along the Rocky Range; On the Pacific Slope; As to Buried Riches and Storied Waters, Cliffs and Mountains. As might be expected and hoped some old friends are here, among them, Rip Van Winkle, Mogg Megone, Hiawatha, Agnes Surriage and Evangeline. As we read the legends and discover the locality to which they belong a strong desire is awakened to visit those points now invested with new interest. Surely all who read these legends will feel that the charm of romance belongs to many places which heretofore were devoid of anything more than the practical growth of the world's progress. We have found these books full of delight and predict for them an enviable place in literature. They will find an honored place beside the rapidly accumulating folk-lore of other lands. They are tastefuly bound and finely illustrated.

Betty of Wye. By Amy E. Blanchard.

The young heroine of this story was the daughter of a mother whose ideas of life and living were far from being practical and systematic, and of a father who was more of a philosopher than a parent. Living on a Southern plantation, surrounded with influences not calculated to develop in a healthy manner her womanly instincts, this young girl nevertheless grew into a womanly woman and, in her small corner, shone with a brightness that lighted the way for those about her. It is a bright cheery story but with not much depth, and there is in it a certain disregard of the love and reverence due a mother, even though she may not be an ideal one. In laying aside any book the most natural question seems to be, "Wherefore was it written?" and in this case we cannot find the reason unless mere entertainment was the object.

E. P. DUTTON AND COMPANY, NEW YORK.

Good Cheer for a Year. Compiled by W. M. L. Jay.

This is the second Year-book which has been compiled from the writings of Phillips Brooks. It contains for each day of the year a scriptural passage, a poetical gem, and a selection from the works of Bishop Brooks. Those who know the original manner of expressing his great thoughts which the wonderful preacher possessed, who remember what lessons of life he taught, how he drew from the word such practical rules for daily living as were a power in his own experience, will look to this compilation for helpful, uplifting thoughts and they will find them in abundance. From the rich storehouse of his writings there have been here gathered such sympathetic, spiritual practical thoughts as must have lasting influence upon all those who begin the days of the year by meditation of them. It cannot be a profitless day whose beginning is illuminated with high and holy thoughts, and the blessings which this Year-book will bring will be manifold. It has been carefully and intelligently compiled and is a most suitable and valuable gift-book.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK.

Stories and Legends from Irving.

There has been, during the past few years, a disposition to use for classes in Literature the Tales of Washington Irving, as they represent the model style of English story-telling. While Irving secured for himself a reputation as a writer of essays, that fame has been overshadowed by his story-telling skill, and so these tales are arranged in attractive and convenient style for students. Ten of Irving's best stories have been gathered into this collection, and they include Dolph Heyliger and Rip Van Winkle. Of the beauty and fascination of these tales we need not speak—they have long since won their way into the hearts of the reading public and they have won a place they will not lose. We consider them as admirably adapted for the purpose for which they have now been published, and are sure they will give to the student in literature a most correct conception of the highest art of story-telling and the best style employed by the story-teller.

L. M. ZIMMERMAN, BALTIMORE.

Sunshine. By the Rev. L. M. Zimmerman, A. M., F. S. Sc.

A great deal of credit is due the individual who in any way makes an effort to brighten the pathway of humanity and that is the aim of this writer. He writes of Sunshine in Life; Sunshine in the Home; Sunshine in the Church; and Sunshine for Others. There are many comforting and practical thoughts in these pages and much advice worth heeding. The book is profusely illustrated and these illustrations suggest many helpful lessons.

PERIODICALS.

The January number of *The Century* contains some choice papers. Among them are "Lenbach: the Painter;" "Speech and Speech-Reading for the Deaf;" "Campaigning with Grant;" "Public Spirit in Modern Athens;" "Summer at Christmas-Tide;" "Nelson in the Battle of the Nile;" "An American Composer: Edward A. Macdowell;" and "The Absurdity of War." The illustrations in this number are exceptionally fine and the fiction, with the exception of one story, first class. We do not consider Hamlin Garland's contribution to this number up to the high standard of the *Century* fiction. Dr. Weir Mitchell's serial is developing finely and is attracting an unusual amount of attention.

The Atlantic Monthly for January has a collection of as choice contributions as can be found between the covers of any magazine. "A Century of Social Betterment;" "Emerson, Sixty Years After;" "Dominant Forces in Southern Life;" the third instalment of that delightful series of papers, "Cheerful Yesterdays;" "Mr. James Lane Allen;" "The Poetry of Rudyard Kipling;" and "Men and Letters" are among the conspicuous contributions. The fiction of this number

is of a high order. Paul Leicester Ford's contribution to that department possesses very unusual merit.

St. Nicholas for January is a splendid New Year number, and the youth who has the promise of this magazine for the coming year can expect much of information, entertainment and amusement from it. "Danny and the Major" is a story that is captivating. "Hop Wing and the Missing Treasure;" "Master Skylark;" "June's Garden;" "Bertholde;" "A Tender-Hearted Monster;" "The True Story of Marco Polo;" "The Last Three Soldiers;" and "St. Nicholas Day in Holland" are the leading features of the January number but there are plenty of other attractions in the way of papers, letters, puzzles and illustrations.

The managers of the *Youth's Companion* are exceptionally fertile in means for improving their paper. During the last year they seemed to have reached their limit, but now they come with a new and attractive feature for 1897. There will be six groups of short stories dealing with personal experiences, unusual incidents, and humorous and pathetic events in professional life. The groups have been contributed (we learn from the prospectus) by ministers, doctors, lawyers, teachers, college professors and journalists. Each profession offers its own peculiar opportunity for noting varying conditions by which character is developed, and right or wrong exemplified. The stories are exceptionally fresh in plot and incident, and will be read with eager interest. Along with this new feature the other attractions of the *Companion* will be as marked as heretofore.

Table Talk for December also gives evidence of special preparation this month. The first contribution is "The Road to Christmas;" "A Hard-Times Diet;" "Mexican Pottery;" "The New Bill of Fare;" "Entertainments;" "When we make Merry at Christmas;" "A Blue-Grass Dining;" "E'er the Dawn of Another Year;" and "What the Housekeeper Does"—all are acceptable but especial care has been given to the recipes and menus, and these the housekeeper will particularly welcome.

THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF

THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

APRIL, 1897.

ARTICLE I.

EARLY HISTORY OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN GEORGIA.*

By D. M. Gilbert, D. D.

In instituting an inquiry as to the beginnings of Lutheranism in Georgia our minds are carried back over the track of considerably more than one hundred and fifty years, and far across the seas to the Austrian crownland of Salzburg. It formerly belonged to Bavaria, but was restored to the Austrian dominion at the peace of 1814. Its capital, bearing the same name, is said to be the most charmingly situated town in Austria or Germany, and was the seat of a line of archbishops who combined the dignity of princes of the German empire with their ecclesiastical rank. Although to this day the population of Salzburg is prevailingly Roman Catholic in religion, at an early period the doctrines of the Reformation had made their way into this mountainous territory, bringing the light and comfort of the Gospel to thousands of minds and hearts. Able Lutheran ministers

*Historical portions of a discourse delivered in the Church of the Ascension, Savannah, Ga., on the occasion of the celebration of its Sesqui-Centennial, Nov. 4, 1894. In the preparation of the discourse free use was made of P. A. Strobel's "History of the Salzburgers;" Dr. H. M. Muhlenberg's "Journal of a Voyage from Philadelphia to Ebenezer;" Prof. M. L. Stoever's Biographical Sketches of Bolzius, Gronau and Bergman; Dr. E. J. Wolf's "Lutherans in America," etc.

proclaimed the truth as it is in Jesus among the people and many copies of the German Bible, the Augsburg Confession, and Luther's Small Catechism, were scattered among the valleys and cottages of that region. The representatives of the papal power were, of course, stirred to activity, to suppress the hated Lutheran heresy! One archbishop after another, armed not only with the anathemas of the Church but with the sword of the secular power, put forth the mailed hand of persecution, often with inhuman cruelty, against these devoted people who sought only to live "as becometh the Gospel of Christ." The time would fail us to describe, in anything of detail, a tithe of what the bitter enemies of their faith compelled them to endure through many dark and weary years. Our historians tell us, that "the Protestant powers of the empire were invoked in their behalf, but, notwithstanding their tardy intervention, insult, outrage and violence continued to be heaped upon them. The distress of their situation at last forced them to unite in a compact for life and death. On a certain Sunday in August, 1731, about one hundred men from every mountain defile, wended their way over rocky paths to a market village, where they gathered around a table on which was placed a vessel of salt. Each man, with earnest prayer, dipped the wetted fingers of his right hand into the salt, and, lifting them to heaven, took a solemn oath. To the true, triune God they swore never to desert the Evangelical faith, and then swallowed the salt as if it had been sacramental bread."

The archbishop greatly exasperated, yet forced to see, from the failure of all the cunning cajolery, intimidating threats, and brutal forces which had been employed to that end in the past, that such uncompromising adherence to deeply rooted convictions could never be shaken, finally issued an edict of banishment which was relentlessly enforced. Between Dec. 1731, and Nov. 1732, Carlyle says some 18,000, others probably about 30,000 people, stripped of their possessions, were driven from the land of their birth as homeless wanderers (many of them in midwinter) not knowing, at first, whither to turn for succor,

save, indeed, to the God in whom they had always trusted, and whose every promise they believed to be sure and steadfast.

No sufferings for conscience' sake, perhaps, ever touched the heart of Europe as deeply as did those of these poor, exiled Salzburgers. Hagenbach says: "Men came to honor in them the martyrs of the truth, the instruments of God who were called again to awaken a dead Christianity,—a leaven to move the sluggish mass of Evangelical Protestantisn." * * "Their march, therefore, through Germany assumed the form of a triumphal procession." Hospitable doors were opened to them, and offers of relief extended, in every direction. The most of them found new homes in Prussia, whose noble king, "from royal, Christian pity and heartfelt sympathy, extended to them a loving hand." Some passed on to Holland, some to Sweden, some to England, while a few others turned their eyes longingly across the turbulent Atlantic toward this western world in assurance of absolute freedom in matters of religious faith and life, and of a much desired rest from the turmoil and sufferings of the past. It is in these we are particularly interested.

We need not pause long to tell the story of their coming. On June 9th, 1732, George II, King of Great Britain, had signed a patent granting the territory called Georgia in his honor, to certain trustees for settlement. Within a few months thereafter a party of colonists was organized under James Oglethorpe, one hundred and sixteen in number, who, reaching their destination, immediately laid out the town which has grown into the beautiful and prosperous city of Savannah. Part of the design of this colony was to establish a refuge for distressed and destitute people of England, which design was afterward enlarged to include especially some of these oppressed Salzburgers, the story of whose wrongs had excited the sympathy of all Protestant Christendom. The offer of the Georgia trustees was gratefully accepted by a number of these needy exiles, who, cheered and aided by liberal grants from the government and contributions from the London Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, promptly came hither, landing at Charleston, S. C., in March 1734, where Oglethorpe cordially welcomed them in per-

son, and five days thereafter the worn, storm-tossed immigrants pitched their tents in Savannah. Oglethorpe, unremitting in kindness, advised and led them in the selection of a permanent home. "By the aid of blazed trees and Indian guides" they made their way through the wilderness until they reached what they regarded a suitable location some twenty-five miles to the north-westward of Savannah, where with prayer and praise, in imitation of Samuel of old, they set up a memorial stone and called the place Ebenezer, or "Hitherto hath the Lord helped us."

This original company of Salzburgers, numbering ninety-one souls, coming to these western shores for conscience' sake, brought with them, not only their Bibles and hymn-books, their catechisms and books of devotion, but were accompanied, also, by two admirably qualified and thoroughly consecrated young pastors, who, shrinking from no toils or sacrifices, devoted the remainder of their lives most unselfishly to the best interests of the people committed to their care. Rev. Jno. Martin Bolzius, then in the thirty-first year of his age, was the senior of these pastors, to whom the chief responsibility was given in the management of affairs, and Rev. Israel Christian Gronau was his worthy and ever faithful assistant. From the time that they joined the colonists, at Rotterdam, in 1733, until it pleased God, in 1745, to take the younger of them in peace to himself, these two men lived and labored together in perfect harmony and warm fraternal affection, everything that the records tell us of them marking them as model under-shepherds of the flock of Christ.

The little colony at Ebenezer, under God's blessing, prospered well almost from the beginning. Favorable reports going abroad concerning it brought two additional companies, aggregating about one hundred and ten persons, in 1735; and these were followed by others in succeeding years, until, in 1741, the population of the settlement numbered more than one thousand two hundred. It was with one of these companies that Oglethorpe, the friend and patron of the Salzburgers already in Georgia, was associated in the voyage—as were also John and Charles Wes-

ley, the latter as Oglethorpe's secretary and the former on a mission to the new world to preach the Gospel to the Indians. And it was here, as he saw these German emigrants, undismayed in the presence of impending destruction to their ship, calmly singing praises to God amid the terrors of the storm, that John Wesley was awakened to the distressing consciousness that he knew nothing of a faith that has power to deliver from the fear of death. He tells us in his journal, that going to America to convert others he found that he was never himself converted. Upon his own authority we have it that only two years later, in a little devotional meeting of Moravians held in Aldersgate St., London, while listening to the reading of Luther's Preface to the Epistle to the Romans,—he found the spiritual light and peace for which his soul had longed.

Uniform testimony has been borne by all who had opportunity to visit Ebenezer, in the early days of its settlement, to the industry and sobriety of its people, and to the simplicity and sincerity of their religious character and life. Whitefield going there in 1738, was greatly pleased by what he saw and learned, and writes: "Their lands are surprisingly improved. They are also blessed with two such pious ministers as I have seldom seen. They have no courts of jurisdiction, but all differences are immediately settled by their pastors. They have an Orphan House in which are seventeen children and a widow." So gratified was he with the school, that he gave, as he tells us, of his own 'poor stores' to Mr. Bolzius for distribution among the orphans; and no doubt suggestions, which came to his benevolent mind there, gave direction to the labors which subsequently issued in that noble charity, Bethesda Orphanage, maintained and managed by the "Union Society" of Savannah, and in which the people of that city justly take pride.

In 1742 Ebenezer was visited by a young minister who was destined to become the most conspicuous figure in the early history of our Church in this country; and the usefulness of whose labors, extending over a period of forty years, can scarcely be exaggerated. Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg, through the instrumentality of Drs. Francke, of the Orphan House at Halle, and

Ziegenhagen, Court Chaplain at London, was this year sent as a missionary to the scattered Lutherans in Pennsylvania. He was, however, directed, first to go to Georgia to confer with pastor Bolzius, (in whose well tested practical wisdom in such work they had confidence), secure his advice and if possible, his company to Pennsylvania, that he might aid in inaugurating the operations for which Muhlenberg had been commissioned. After a tedious and somewhat perilous voyage of more than three months, Muhlenberg landed at Charleston, S. C., Sept. 22nd, and, taking but two days for rest, proceeded immediately to Savannah, where he fortunately found Mr. Gronau, with whom he journeyed on horseback to Ebenezer. He remained eight days with Bolzius and Gronau, enjoying a welcome rest from the fatigues of his long voyage, advising with these brethren as to methods of work, participating with pastors and people in worship and holy communion, and was much gratified by the condition and prospects of the Salzburger settlements. Mr. Bolzius, with some reluctance, concluded to comply with Dr. Z's request to accompany Muhlenberg to Pennsylvania; but on reaching Charleston and finding, after four days delay, that there would probably be no northward-bound vessel from that point on which they could secure passage before Spring, decided that duty required him to return to his work at Ebenezer. Thirty years later Muhlenberg again visited Georgia under authority from the fathers in Germany, not for a little season of refreshment and rest, but to spend several months of anxious and discouraging labor over the affairs of our churches.

While we have various pleasing pictures given us of the prosperity of the Salzburger settlements in the early days of their history, we are not to think for a moment that these devoted people were exempt from the difficulties, discouragements and sufferings ordinarily incident to the colonizing of a strange, wilderness country. Their venture was made under exceptionally favorable circumstances. The settlers themselves were a people of piety, industry and thrift, inured to hardship and toil. No better men could have been found to guide and help them in things temporal and spiritual than the faithful pastors Bolzius

and Gronau. They had received a liberal grant of money from the British Government, as also from the London Society for the promotion of Christian knowledge, and generous gifts from friends in Germany. They had the means of subsistence for themselves and their families assured until able to maintain themselves from the fruits of their labor, and every settler received a homestead of fifty acres free of cost. They were largely under the direction and patronage of Drs. Urlspeiger, senior pastor at Augsburg, Ziegenhagen, of London, and Francke, of Halle, whose sympathy, counsel and more substantial evidences of interest in their welfare were unfailing; and they had, finally, a constant and most generous friend in Gen. Oglethorpe, the authorized representative of the Georgia trustees. But notwithstanding all this, which would seem to guarantee comfort and success from the beginning, the first years of our Salzburgers in Georgia were full of sore trials and disappointments. After they had erected, with great difficulty because of the scarcity of suitable materials and the lack of mechanical skill among them, what they hoped would be permanent homes, and with persistent labor had, at least, partially cleared their little plantations, it was found that they had located upon about as sterile a spot of land as all that region of the Georgia territory contained. The sad experience of a season or two showed that they could not raise from it adequate supplies for their subsistence. Then it was discovered that the creek on which they had settled, Ebenezer creek, was not only difficult of navigation but so tortuous in its flow that, while the distance from Ebenezer to the Savannah river was but six miles by land, it was twenty-five miles by the course of the creek; and most of the supplies needed in this time of scarcity had to be carried by the colonist from Savannah on their backs. In addition to these troubles much sickness, supposed to be largely due to their immediate surroundings, prevailed and the mortality became very distressing. It is not to be wondered at that, under such circumstances, a spirit of discontent should become prevalent among the Salzburgers, and that they should conclude with unanimity that the ills which they endured could only be remedied by a removal. Oglethorpe,

always kind and ready to do what he might be able to promote the welfare of the colonists, went up to Ebenezer, in company with the pastors, to confer with the people as to the causes of dissatisfaction and the proposed change of location. After hearing all that was to be said, and admitting that the discontent was not without reason, he was nevertheless not favorable to the idea of removal upon the ground that the time and labor already expended in clearing their lands and erecting their homes would thereby be lost, and that, from his knowledge of the site to which they purposed going, he felt sure that, as soon as the forests should be cut down and their lands brought under cultivation, they would be afflicted by the same diseases in the new homes from which they had suffered in the old. At the same time the General assured them, that if they persisted in their desire he would not oppose, but aid them in as far as practicable in carrying out their plans. The removal was finally determined upon and our Salzburgers, then about two hundred in number, abandoned, at the end of two years, their first place of settlement. The site chosen for the new town was a romantic spot on a high ridge near the Savannah river, and about six miles east of the original location. It was this *new* Ebenezer which Whitefield visited in 1738 and Muhlenberg in 1742, and of which glowing descriptions were written to the patrons in Germany by Bolzius and others.

Of the Salzburgers who reached Georgia in 1736 Oglethorpe desired to send a considerable number southward to aid in establishing the town of Frederica, on St. Simon's Island, near the mouth of the Atlanta river; where it was proposed also to erect a fort, and station a garrison, to defend the frontier against threatened incursions by the Spaniards. The mass of these Germans, however, who had come over under the conduct of Baron Von Reck and a Captain Hermsdorf, had their hearts set upon Ebenezer and the superior advantages to be enjoyed there, nevertheless Captain Hermsdorf was successful in raising a small company of volunteers who went to Frederica to aid in its settlement and defense. These became the nucleus of a Lutheran congregation at that point. Their pastor was Rev. Ulrich Dries-

ler, a German missionary who was sent over by the Georgia Trustees in 1743. We know little of him and his brief work, beyond the few facts recorded by Bolzius,—that he visited the Ebenezer brethren in 1744 and preached in their churches and at Savannah,—that Capt. Horton, commandant of the fort at Frederica, gave him "an honorable testimony," and that in his little congregation of sixty-two souls his labors seemed to be blessed. Mr. Driesler died in 1745, and the colony itself, indeed, soon disappeared. One writing of it, in 1751, speaks of it "as presenting the melancholy prospect of houses without inhabitants, barracks without soldiers, guns without carriages, and streets grown over with weeds. All appeared to me with a horrible aspect, and so different from what I once knew it, that I could scarce refrain from tears."

Savannah was, of course, the one market town of the Salzburger colonists, and the port through which they had communication with the outside world. Of these early settlers, therefore, some few naturally found there remunerative work and a home; and to these there were accessions from time to time, from the northern part of the country and beyond the sea, until in 1744 there was found to be quite a congregation of German Lutherans in the town. And our Ebenezer pastors were not the men to be negligent of the spiritual interests of any of their brethren of the same blood and faith who were at all within their reach. We have record of early visits and service by Bolzius at Charleston and it is not to be supposed that they would be indifferent to the welfare of those who were much nearer at hand and with whom they were having almost constant communication. It seems evident from the manner in which Bolzius writes of Mr. Driesler's preaching for them, not only in the Ebenezer churches, but at *Savannah*, that they were accustomed, at least at that early day, (Feb. 1744) to have more or less regular appointments for service there.

At the first Ebenezer the people were compelled to worship in a large wooden tent, which, during part of the time, had been the residence of their pastors. In the new town, which was laid

out after the plan of the city of Savannah and became a very attractive place, two-thirds of a square were appropriated to the church, parsonage and school, and an equal quantity to the orphanage and a public storehouse. As funds had been received from Germany for the establishment of an orphan asylum and that was one of the first buildings erected, it was used, also, as the place of worship for several years, until Jerusalem church was built. At about the same time, because the colonists were rapidly settling on the river below the town and along the road leading from Ebenezer to Savannah, it became necessary to establish a second church called "Zion," about four miles distant from the former place. Both these churches were in use in 1744. Up the river, too, the population increased so rapidly that, in 1751, a tract of one hundred acres of land was secured from the Georgia Trustees, about five miles north-west of Ebenezer, and a commodious church called "Bethany," together with a school-house and a residence for the teacher were built. And very soon thereafter at Goshen, ten miles below Ebenezer, near the road leading to Savannah, a small church was built for the accommodation of the Salzburgers of that neighborhood. The titles to these church properties gave Muhlenberg no little anxiety and labor during his visit of more than twenty years later. The deed of Bethany, *e. g.*—and the others were similar—called for one hundred acres of land "in St. Matthew's Parish for the use of a church and school-house, and for the support and maintenance of the minister and master thereof." There was just cause for fear lest, under defining clauses like that, the Church of England would ultimately take possession of buildings and lands together. Muhlenberg never rested until this dangerous vagueness of title was corrected.

Whether the first congregational assemblies in Savannah were held in private houses, or in some school, or other room, more suitable for the purpose, cannot now be ascertained. The first record we have concerning a fixed place for Lutheran service there, is to the effect that, in 1756, six men of the congregation bought a lot of ground for £150, (the same lot on which the beautiful Church of the Ascension stands to-day) and a wooden

court house (Rathaus) for £18, which, after it had been moved to the purchased site was repaired and made ready for use as a church. The item of improvement particularly mentioned is the building of a steeple and supplying it with a bell. This first Lutheran Church building in Savannah was destroyed by fire in 1797. It was promptly rebuilt, however, five hundred dollars of the money needed for that purpose being contributed by St. John's Church, Charleston.

Our early Georgia pastors were very busy men, burdened with many cares and responsibilities; and they are worthy of all praise for the untiring industry and conscientious fidelity they exhibited in the discharge of their trust. Their field of labor was large and they were diligent in preaching and catechizing the young on Sundays and giving weekly lectures in the churches. In addition to their ministerial work, they had many onerous duties of a secular character in the management of the funds collected in Europe for the benefit of the Ebenezer congregation. Mr. Bolzius seems to have been the appointed trustee of the patrons and assisted by his colleagues, was much occupied, in the early years, in making investments, purchasing land, erecting rice mills, as well as grist mills and saw mills; introducing silk culture, and superintending the whole industrial economy of the colony. He was amenable to some degree, to the Georgia Trustees, as well as to the London Society, and to the patrons in Germany; and in his administration of affairs never appears to have done anything that did not meet with approval.

In 1745 the senior pastor, and the whole colony, experienced a severe loss in the death of Mr. Gronau. We can understand the sad. sense of bereavement by which Mr. Bolzius was oppressed as he wrote—"Last Friday, January 11th, it pleased the Lord to call my dear brother and colleague to his rest;" and can appreciate, too, the comfort that came to him as he was permitted to add: "He fell asleep full of joy in his Saviour * * The time of his illness was a source of edification to all of us who were daily about his person. * * Nothing troubled him, for he had an abiding sense of reconciliation with God, and realized the joy and peace of the Holy Ghost."

Early in the Spring of 1746, Rev. Herman H. Lembke was sent to Ebenezer by the patrons in Germany to supply the place made vacant by the death of Gronau. The selection was in every way judicious and Mr. Lembke by his character and labors greatly endeared himself to the people and showed himself worthy of all confidence.

Ebenezer and the surrounding settlements gradually increasing by occasional arrivals from Germany and otherwise, in 1752 the patrons of the church in Europe thought it necessary to send over an additional minister in the person of Rev. Christian Rabenhorst. Here again they could scarcely have made a better choice. In his diary and letters Bolzius seems to delight in opportunities for testifying to his ability and unremitting activity in the work for which he was appointed. This appears to have been the most prosperous period in the history of the Salzburgers, when for twelve years these three devoted men labored together diligently, harmoniously and successfully for both the temporal and spiritual welfare of their people. Bolzius writes—"We all have work enough to do and do all with pleasure." * * "Though we have not been free from trials and difficulties, still they have been light, and as we trust, have been subservient to our welfare and furtherance in the divine life, through the kind direction of a wise Providence." * * "With my dear brethren in office Messrs. Lembke and Rabenhorst, I stand in the most friendly collegiate connection. Every week we meet in conference and for prayer, by which meetings our mutual love is cemented through the blessing of God. The same blessing also prevents our labor among the people from being unfruitful. Though on account of the war (with the Spaniards) and repeated failure of crops, every article of living is high, yet our heavenly Father gives us our daily bread in the enjoyment of peace and health among ourselves. If many, who in the first seasons of trial left us, had endured a little while longer, they would have experienced the truth of the proverb: 'After winter, spring does come.'"

But growing infirmities admonished the senior pastor that he may not be permitted much longer to watch over the interests

of his Salzburgers. As early as April 15th, 1757, he had a legal instrument drawn, which was approved by the fathers in Germany, by virtue of which the trust which had been vested in him as administrator of the affairs of the church and the property of the congregation should be transferred at his death to Mr. Lembke. He was spared, however, for some years longer, and would not suffer himself to be relieved of any of his duties as long as it was possible for him to perform them. On the 19th of Nov. 1765, he calmly resigned his spirit into the hands of the Lord, having faithfully served as senior pastor of the Salzburgers for thirty-two years.

The chief work of importance done under the direction of Mr. Lembke was perhaps the building of the New Jerusalem Church at Ebenezer, a substantial brick structure eighty by sixty feet in dimensions. It was completed in 1769. Its durability seems to have been unaffected by time and descendants of the Salzburgers still worship there. The time of Mr. Lembke's death it has been impossible to ascertain. It probably occurred in 1772 or '73.

Very soon thereafter Rev. Christopher F. Triebner was sent over by the Rev. fathers in Germany as an associate for Mr. Rabenhorst. With his coming there was the beginning of very serious trouble for the Georgia churches. Mr. Triebner was a young man of fine talents, but ambitious, conceited, not very scrupulous in the use of means for the attainment of his ends, and apparently a born agitator. Claiming to be invested with certain authority by the fathers in Germany he sought to set aside the old pastors, notwithstanding the experience and honorable record of more than twenty years of faithful and efficient service at Ebenezer, and take to himself the direction of affairs. Certain circumstances conspired to forward in a measure his designs. Mr. Lembke, several years before his death, had arranged, by a document, similar to that by which Bolzius had transferred the duties and responsibilities of senior pastor and trustee to him, to ensure the succession to Mr. Rabenhorst. It appeared, however, that the authorities in Europe had never formally sanctioned this transfer, which seemed to leave Mr.

Rabenhorst in third place, the place of his original appointment, should there again be three ministers at Ebenezer. Again, not long after his arrival, Triebner was married to a daughter of Mr. Lembke, who was also a niece of the venerated Bolzius, and there was not a little of family influence on the side of the young man's supposed rights and interests. We can readily imagine, without going into any of the details of the trouble, how much of turmoil and strife a shrewd, energetic man like Triebner could stir up as he moved through the settlements depreciating the character of the older pastor and seeking to exalt himself.

It was to inquire into and adjust these difficulties and, if possible, heal all dissensions, that Muhlenberg was sent to Georgia in 1774. Through the whole trouble—as, indeed, in all the history of his twenty-five years of service—Rabenhorst showed himself to be a very noble man. He was mild, conciliatory, compliant, ready to concede almost anything when no sacrifice of important principle was involved. He could afford simply to smile at much of the vaporing of his much younger brother; but he was firm as a rock, bold as a lion, in resistance to anything that he felt in conscience to be wrong and injurious to the cause of the Lord and the best welfare of the people committed to his care. Muhlenberg's testimony to his character and conduct is given repeatedly and with no uncertain sound. It may be gathered from his journal, that from the time he landed at Charleston every one he met, who was competent to speak of Rabenhorst at all, spoke of him in terms of praise. And after three months of association with these pastors and people, he writes: "When I see with my own eyes, and hear with my own ears in intercourse, that the man possesses a heart of grace, excellent gifts to preach, and still more aptness to catechise; that he insists upon a new creature in Christ Jesus, upon radical repentance, living faith, and daily renewal; and that he adorns his sound doctrine with an edifying, sober and godly life, etc.—when I reflect on all this, I must wonder, in my simplicity, what could have been the preponderating reasons which prevented our reverend fathers from appointing Rev. Rabenhorst *first* preacher after the death of Rev. Lembke; and even induced

them to place at his side, as second preacher, a young man, who, although well meaning and gifted, was nevertheless, inexperienced, passionate, and a dangerous novice; and moreover to continue Mr. Rabenhorst as third preacher! Most heartily would I have regarded myself as fortunate, if the Lord had lent us in Pennsylvania a laborer like Mr. R., and I would rejoice even in my last days to be the adjunct of such a man." * * "Although Mr. R., had been most grossly wronged"—he adds—"and had been publicly assailed in honor, office and reputation, yet he was the first, with tears, to extend his hand to his offender, to forgive everything, and to ask forgiveness." And then Dr. M. gives the conclusion he has reached by his patient investigation as follows: "In my humble estimation Mr. R. is the only man possessed of understanding and experience who, with divine assistance, can save the Ebenezer congregations from destruction. If the Rev. fathers will only appoint him first preacher, will hold Mr. Triebner tighter in hand, and honor Mr. R. with a paternal and familiar correspondence, all may yet be well."

Dr. Muhlenberg had measurably accomplished the object of his southern mission, yet he bade his Georgia friends "good bye" and turned his face northward, evidently, with many misgivings as to the future. But sore trials of a different kind are awaiting our Salzburgers and are near at hand. Even as M. left Georgia there could be heard the ominous mutterings of the coming storm which culminated in our American Revolution. Muhlenberg left Savannah on the 20th February 1775. On the 4th of July in that same year a convention of representatives of the Georgia Parishes was held in Savannah to consider the questions of difference between the colonies and the mother country and to determine what should be the attitude of the Province in the impending struggle. Of the representatives from St. Matthews' Parish five were prominent Salzburgers; and ultimately, as a whole, our German colonists were on the side of the Patriots—many of them serving faithfully and efficiently in the continental army. They said: "We have experienced the evils of tyranny in our own land; for the sake of liberty we have left home,

lands, houses, estates and have taken refuge in the wilds of Georgia; shall we now again submit to bondage? *Never.*"

During the war the British forces held Savannah and the surrounding country for three years and six months, during which period the people, especially in the country, suffered grievously. In these trying times the differences of character between the Ebenezer pastors were more fully revealed than ever. Triebner, upon the arrival of the British, promptly betook himself to Savannah and took the oath of allegiance to the crown. It is said that it was at his instigation, and indeed under his conduct, that a hostile force was at once sent to Ebenezer, to confiscate or destroy property. Many of the people were driven out from their burning homes to find shelter as best they could. All who would not take the oath were constantly exposed to insult and violence. Among the marked men whom Maj. Maitland, commandant of the detachment, particularly sought,—were Jno. Adam Treutlen, *Rebel Gov.;* Wm. Holsendorf, Rebel Counsellor, Jno. Stirk, Rebel Col., Samuel Stirk, Rebel Sec'y, Jno. Snyder, planter,—and many others. Mr. Rabenhorst's home, near Goshen, was one of the first given to the flames, and he went out among his scattered people ministering to them with unselfish devotion until, sometime before the close of the war, precisely when we know not, sinking under the exposure, anxiety and toils of the situation, he was carried to his burial amid the lamentations of those for whom, for twenty-five years, he had so earnestly and lovingly labored.

At the close of the Revolution the Ebenezer settlements presented a scene of desolation. Many of the people were compelled to begin anew, and under much less favorable circumstances than before, the establishment of homes and raising a subsistence for themselves and their families. Jerusalem Church, though not destroyed, had been used first as a hospital, then as a commissary store-house, and finally, for a considerable time as a stable for horses. The marks of such use are still pointed out to visitors to the old sanctuary. One of the first things to which the more pious of the returning Salzburgers addressed themselves was to thoroughly cleanse the sacred edifice and restore

it as nearly as possible to its former condition. But they sadly miss the leadership, and the services and sacraments to which they were accustomed. The faithful old pastors, Bolzius, Gronau, Lembke, Rabenhorst were in their graves. Triebner, even if his services would have been now acceptable to any of them, had prudently, upon the evacuation of Savannah, gone with his military friends to England.

Once more the Salzburgers turn appealingly to the Fatherland, begging through Dr. Muhlenberg, who warmly urged their petition, that a suitable minister might be sent to break to them the bread of life. Nor did their cry fall upon unsympathetic ears. As promptly as possible Rev. Jno. Ernest Bergman was sent to them, who is described as "a young man of decided talents and extensive literary acquirements," and "though not endowed with a vigorous constitution, yet a man of energy and great industry." Mr. Bergman reached Georgia in the Spring of 1785, and not unnaturally looked almost with dismay upon the work he had undertaken. There was much to discourage. The people recovered but slowly from the disastrous effects of the war. The town of Ebenezer was almost entirely deserted during the protracted conflict, and many of the settlements were nearly broken up. The congregations were scattered, the records mutilated or destroyed, and the demoralizing influences of the war were painfully evident in the lives of many of the Salzburgers both in the country and in Savannah. Mr. Bergman more than once almost despaired of restoring order and reorganizing the churches on a permanent footing. Ebenezer was never, I think, fully rebuilt and gradually dwindled away. Apart from other reasons Oglethorpe was right in his view of the location. Though upon a beautiful plateau on a high bank of the river, it was bounded upon the other three sides by low-lying swamp lands subject to periodical inundation, so that on the score of health it became anything but a desirable place of residence. For, perhaps, forty years past no house has been left standing near the site of Ebenezer, save the quaint, old Jerusalem Church.

Mr. Bergman addressed himself very earnestly to the task before him. It was a large and difficult field (which had hitherto had the labors of two and, for twelve years, of three devoted pastors) which he now single-handed and under very great disadvantages, was set to cultivate. He endeavored, however, to systematize his work and to give what service he could to the congregation in Savannah as well as to those in the country. He endeavored to revive the parochial schools—a master named Barnhard being sent over with him for that purpose. Barnhard subsequently removed to South Carolina where he became a useful Lutheran minister, and left a son in the ministry—Rev. David Barnhard—who was held by the Lutherans of South Carolina in very high esteem. Mr. Bergman's ministry at Ebenezer extended over a period of thirty-nine years. He was not equaled by any of his predecessors in point of learning, but they went far beyond him in practical management of the affairs of the Church and of every-day life. Never so well satisfied as when among his books, as he advanced in life he became more and more a student rather than a pastor. In 1804 he gave up the congregation in Savannah altogether, partly because of declining strength and the extent of his field, but very largely, from his own testimony, because of a lack of appreciation of his services.

In 1824 Lutheranism in Georgia was on the eve of dissolution. Mr. Bergman was dying. His son, Rev. Christopher F. Bergman, who had received a classical education and been carefully instructed in theology under the tuition of his learned father, had just applied for and received license to preach the gospel under the auspices of the Presbyterian Church, He appears to have been under the impression that the Lutheran Church in the South had no longer any existence. The congregation in Savannah, destitute of pastoral service for twenty years, was almost hopelessly scattered, and its small church building occupied as a Sunday-school by another communion. It was when affairs were at this low ebb as regards the interests of our Church in Georgia that the late Rev. Dr. John Bachman, the value of whose labors for the establishment of Lutheranism

in the South has never been fully estimated, visited Savannah and Ebenezer. He came not a day too soon. It was always matter for rejoicing with him and many others that he did not come too late. In Savannah he brought together the few dispersed members of the church to be found who were willing to unite in an attempt at reorganization, cheered them with encouraging words, and within a month sent them as pastor Rev. Stephen A. Mealy, who had studied theology under his direction and just been ordained. Mr. Mealy served the congregation with efficiency and success for fifteen years. At Ebenezer Dr. Bachman was welcomed with gladness. His visit was a great comfort to the elder Bergman, whose ministry of nearly forty years was now ended, and was fruitful in other blessed results. He was able to make such representations to the son as cleared the way for his withdrawal from the ecclesiastical connection he had formed; and, to the joy of the people, secured his consent to become his father's successor. The father closed his eyes in peace on the 25th of February, 1824. At the meeting of the newly organized Synod of South Carolina, in the following November, the son "was solemnly ordained to the Gospel ministry by the Rev. Messrs. Bachman, Hersher and Dreher." He was a man of fine attainments and devoted piety, and ministered faithfully to the Ebenezer congregations until called away from earth on the 26th of March, 1832.

The beginning of a new era in the history of our Georgia churches dates from the entrance upon their ministry of these two young men,—Mealy and C. F. Bergman,—and their introduction of the English language in the services. If the advancement made in this later and better period has seemed to be slow there are reasons for it upon which we cannot fully enter now. Suffice it to say now, that the churches in Effingham county have been weakened by various migrations; that the endowment of Jerusalem Church for many years proved a hindrance to church enterprise; and that in Georgia, as elsewhere in our country, at the time when opportunities for progress were, perhaps, most favorable, Lutheranism had lost those opportunities under the weakening, wasting influences of adherence to a for-

eign tongue. Bishop Asbury, of the M. E. Church, with whom Mr. Bergman was quite intimate, as well as others outside of our communion, foresaw and pointed out what would inevitably result from continuing the use of German exclusively in the churches. Asbury wrote to Mr. B. on one occasion: "I think as you are not advanced in age, if you wish to be extensively useful, you ought by all means to learn to preach, as well as to write, English. By close application and a little assistance you would soon gain a good accent and pronunciation. In learning to preach English you will open a door to preach to thousands in this country; besides you will get good as well as do good." But there is no evidence to show that Mr. Bergman ever seriously entertained such a proposition. In an isolated German settlement like that of our Salzburgers in Georgia (for at an early day German immigration had been diverted from the South to other parts of the country) with the church in Savannah for twenty years without any regular pastoral care, and the congregations in the country served only in a language which could be useful and acceptable to a constantly diminishing number of people, it is not strange that the rising generation should seek a church home and privileges elsewhere. It might, perhaps, be more justly wondered at to-day, not that there are so *few* but that there are so many Lutherans in Georgia.

Our Salzburger settlements, however, have left an important impress upon the population of the state. The names of descendants of these Lutheran colonists, many of them prominent names in business and professional life, may be found in considerable numbers on the records of various churches in Savannah and other parts of the state; and serve to illustrate the truth of the declaration made by one of our Southern brethren, to the effect, that it seemed to be part of the mission of the Lutheran Church in this country to furnish all other churches with much of the best material they have.

ARTICLE II.

THE RELATIVE POSITIONS OF REGENERATION AND JUSTIFICATION IN LUTHERAN DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

By Rev. Frederick H. Knubel, A. M.

Among dogmatic writers of the Lutheran Church there is much disagreement as to the order in which the parts of that division of Dogmatic Theology, which is usually called "The Application of Redemption," should be placed. In many parts the order followed by all is alike; but in the arrangement of regeneration, conversion, repentance and justification almost every possible combination of these four words can be found in some author. Inasmuch, however, as every author combines to a greater or less extent regeneration, conversion and repentance under one part (some combine all three; others, regeneration and conversion; still others, conversion and repentance), it will be necessary for us to consider only two—regeneration and justification. When they are settled, the other two will be easily adjusted. The subject before us is: Should regeneration precede justification, or justification precede regeneration in Lutheran Dogmatic Theology?

From the outset be it noted that there is no essential difference between these various authors as to what really takes place in the course of the individual appropriation of redemption. It is not a question of synergism or predestination. It is simply a matter of what part in that course shall bear the name regeneration, and what part the name justification. In accordance with the parts named, the names take their order. It might seem senseless, therefore, to discuss the subject. We are led to it, however, because 1, It is a matter of much annoyance to the student of Lutheran writers; 2, We have not found a clear discussion of it in books or magazines to which we have access at present; 3, We believe that a thoroughly rational and Scriptural decision can be reached in favor of one side.

We see, then, that the question resolves itself into a decision upon the definitions of regeneration and justification. All Lutheran dogmaticians agree upon that great centre of our system, justification, differences being of a very minute and shadowy nature. Therefore our whole task lies in the settling of the definition of regeneration. When that is once decided, the other parts will easily assume their places.

What then are the various definitions of regeneration found in our writers? We believe they can be classed faithfully under the following heads:*

A. That work of God, the Holy Spirit, in an individual, after the illuminating call, by which he is brought to faith in Jesus Christ.

B. As an equivalent for justification.

C. The imparting of a new life principle to the individual by God, the Holy Ghost, as a result of the call, repentance and justification.

D. For "sanctification and renewal."

E. "In a general sense as comprehending the entire change in man's condition, including both justification and the succeeding renewal."

For the sake of simplifying our discussion, let us see if we cannot dispose of several of these. It is evident that those who define as in B (only one or two of the earliest writers [*e. g.* Melanchthon] occasionally speak thus, and in other passages they define differently) may be considered, for the sake of our discussion, under A. When the point of faith is reached, there is no further change *in the individual* before he is justified. Thus these writers spake merely in a general way when they implied that regeneration is a synonym for justification.

Class D is represented also by but one or two very early writers (*e. g.* Luther), and then only in an occasional passage. Inasmuch as any writer, who would *uniformly* so define, would take the same position as C in our discussion, we can leave D out of consideration.

*Compare Jacobs' Edition of the Book of Concord, p. 572, 18ff., and Valentine's "Outlines of Theology," p. 210.

We are justified above all in discarding these two classes, for the sake of our discussion, by the fact that their representatives wrote in the time before regeneration had received any sort of settled definition in our Church, and when the term was used by every writer in several different senses. This will be evident further on.

Those who define according to class E (*e. g.* Frank) do not use the term in the dogmatic sense at all, as Frank himself says (System der Christlichen Wahrheit, 3rd Edit., I, 296), but merely for the sake of a uniformly expressed division of their system. Thus Frank divides the whole doctrine concerning man into Generation, man as created; Degeneration, man as under sin; Regeneration, man as under grace. When he comes to that which is specifically called regeneration in dogmatics, he states his intention of using for it only the term "New Birth" (Wiedergeburt,) so that there may be no confusion. Thus we may discard this class also.

The result is that we have reduced the definitions of regeneration, for our present use, to two. We repeat them.

A. That work of God, the Holy Spirit, in an individual, after the illuminating call, by which he is brought to faith in Jesus Christ.

C. The imparting of a new life-principle to the individual by God, the Holy Ghost, as a result of the call, repentance and justification.

These two definitions are of our own shaping, but we believe that all the Lutheran dogmaticians would be willing to class themselves under either the one or the other. We have formed the one, A, as a consensus of all those dogmaticians who place regeneration before justification; the other, C, as a consensus of all those who place regeneration after justification. It is evident that such a relative placing is necessary upon the acceptance of either the one or the other definition.

The definition A is, we believe, perfectly clear. It states that regeneration is that which the Holy Spirit effects in a man between the illuminating call (terminus a quo) and faith (terminus ad quem) in bringing the man to that faith. The definition C is

also clear, we believe. However, we quote here extensively from several prominent supporters of such a definition, in order that there may be no misunderstanding:

Luthardt (Dogmatik, 9th Edit., p. 295): "In and with faith the Holy Spirit becomes the principle of a new life in regeneration."

Valentine (Outlines of Theology, Edit., of 1889, p. 209ff., several changes have been made in later editions, we know, but these are not accessible to us at present and they do not change the following quotations, we believe.): "The divine saving work must extend beyond justification. Unless that which is external and juridical, pardoning and accrediting us with the vicarious righteousness of Christ, and restoring to position of sonship through adoption, is followed by an internal correcting of our disorded nature, our corrupt constitution, the work must fail to afford real salvation from the fall. We need healing as well as forgiveness. * * This inner part of the saving work occurs especially in regeneration and renewal. * * Regeneration is a work wrought by God through the Holy Spirit, in which he works in man the gracious power of living a new spiritual life, or that change in his nature by which he is enabled to live a life of true love, obedience and holiness. It is to be distinguished from conversion mainly in that it refers to the divine enabling action of God communicating the powers of the "new," that is renewed, quickened, truly obedient life in God, while conversion expresses the actual turning from sin to holiness under the gracious influence of that given power. * * Regeneration is that divine operation of quickening the powers of the soul out of their natural deadness in sin into capability of new, holy living to God. * * The process or work includes and fulfills all the precedent action of the Spirit's work. * * It is a change from a wrong to a right principle of living." (There are several expressions in the text which decidedly support definition A, and consequently support the placing of regeneration before justification. However, if our memory serve us well, those are just the parts which have been corrected in later editions.)

Thomasius, who states his position, as usual, with wonderful

clearness and force (Christi Person und Werk, 3rd Edit., p. 464ff.): "The entrance of justification is *directly* accompanied by a *radical change of the inner attitude of the human personality towards God.*

"In the preceding penitence, the man gave up already his supposed righteousness with all its claims, and brake with his whole sinful past. In this inner judgment of himself, he condemned his natural, God-opposing self, and became pervaded with a longing for freedom from the guilt, but also from the power of sin. In faith, he, again going out from himself, grasped the free grace of God with the whole energy of his inner personality, but, on the other hand, experienced, in the forgiveness received, the testimony of this grace to him, namely: the reception as a child of God. Thus faith was the decisive turning point in his inner life; it is *the great ethical act of turning away from the old, natural alienation from God to the God of salvation,* a really new attitude of the human ego. Renouncing self in its natural and unsaved condition, the believer *has laid himself open* to the grace of God and has made *it and it alone* the *goal* and *centre* of his desire and longing. This radical change in the inner attitude of the man is given directly in and with the act of faith; it does not first appear after faith, it is not accomplished by the justification obtained; it is faith's own movement, by which it completes and finishes itself. Just on that account, as can be recognized already now, this faith becomes the principle of a new living activity of the man; the reception of the love of God in Christ, which is his very nature, and the experience which the man has of this love in justification, cannot remain without an active return.

"The latter does not follow, however, with the same directness from the very nature of faith as the aforementioned new attitude towards God. For faith in itself has always a receptive and surrendering, not a creative nature; taking, not giving is its nature. But here that dialectical relation progresses, according to which every step in the way of salvation, attained by grace, becomes the medium for a fuller and more vital communication to man

of the same grace, and thus the advance to a new and relatively higher step. *God does not forgive*, without *giving*, and just that forgiveness which was received in faith (wrought by the Spirit) becomes the means for the reception of the (new) gift. Thus the further progress, with which we are now dealing, is to be understood. That is, when the human personality has, in the described way, by virtue of justifying faith, turned towards and opened itself unto God, then the *Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Christ*, can sink more richly and deeply into that personality; he can, when received through faith, on the one hand, confirm unto the self-conscious ego the forgiveness and divine sonship received in justification; on the other hand, he can thereby penetrate the whole *spiritual being* of the man to its very foundation, and thus he can so develop and lead into conscious acts of will *the spiritual life*, which baptism had planted in that foundation, that it becomes the ruling principle of the *person* of the believer. This is, therefore, a deepening of the conversio through the agency of justification by faith, a filling of faith with positive powers of grace and life, a potentiation of the described effect of (child) baptism. We can call it, in distinction from the last, the *personal regeneration*, because by it a new person is created, or, more exactly, the new man, which baptism had engendered, is born—born, that is to say, brought to maturity, developed into full living power and independence. This regeneration occurs in time along with justification; it is the subjective correlate of the event that occurs in that moment, when penitent faith has attained unto a real grasp of the grace of Christ—the latter, nevertheless, forming the inner condition for the former. For, without faith's experience of justifying grace, the personal regeneration by the Spirit of Christ does not take place: faith and justification are the conditions upon which it takes place. However, the reverse is also true: Without this regenerating work of the Spirit, justifying faith does not become an active and energetic life principle.

"Howbeit, like every work of the Spirit, accomplished through the word, the genesis of this new birth remains a mystery for him who passes through it. For it is a creative work of the Spirit, which, as we said, reaches to the very centre of man's

being—to that point, where natural and personal life are mysteriously bound together. Thus it can be in no way imagined how it develops that beginning of new life, which was established in baptism. The whole process itself is a riddle. Only the completed fact enters the light of consciousness and becomes, for the Christian, a subject for thanksgiving and an exhortation to holy faithfulness unto so intensive a gift of grace.

"The result is *a higher step in the living and loving communion* of the believer with Christ, and, through Christ, with the Father and the Holy Spirit: * * the unio mystica. On the *divine* side this living communion is nothing else than the active immanence of Christ in the believer; on the *human side* it is *love.*"

We believe that a study of these lengthy quotations will show that we have properly framed definition C. Our whole task consists, therefore, in deciding between A and C. If A be right, then regeneration must precede justification. If C be right, then justification must precede regeneration.

Let us, then, look briefly, in the first place, at the history and present stand of writers in our Church on this question.*

In the sixteenth century, there were, as we have already shown from the Formula of Concord, many definitions for regeneration. The word was used first in one sense, then in another, although doubtless each author had really some more or less definite idea concerning it in his mind. There was at that time no fully developed ordo salutis, as we have it now. Following the Formula of Concord, the older dogmaticians had merely the foundation of our present developed order, namely: Repentance, Justification and Good Works. Around these the teaching concerning the appropriation of salvation was grouped. Very easily it could be done too.

However, this could not prove satisfactory. The work of devout minds upon the Holy Scriptures must produce development. Such is ever the effect of the Holy Spirit's working through the word upon the minds of men. The Scriptures

*See for the history more fully: Philippi, Kirchlich Glaubenslehre, V, 1, 108 ff. Also other dogmaticians generally.

spoke of the call, of enlightenment or illumination, of regeneration, of conversion, etc. Truly, the confessions of the Church and the old dogmaticians had used these terms, but there had been no determination of their meaning. Thus the work gradually went on, until finally the tireless worker and shrewd student, Abraham Calovius, 1612–1686, no longer able to adhere to the old classification, established the ordo salutis, which is, to greater or less extent, the same that we have to-day. We need only read the words of the sermon delivered at his funeral, in order to know whence he drew the results. It says: "A man who, in his method of teaching, drew the holy wisdom from no other source than the Holy Bible, who would recognize no other ground of faith than the word of God." (Mensel's Kirchliches Handlexikon, I, 639). Variations from his arrangement are found in many later writers and several crude things have been permanently changed. But that which concerns us is to see that he arranges regeneration before justification, and is to be classed under definition A. Amid all changes that took place after him, this one thing remained settled. All Lutheran writers up to the present century, so far as we have been able to search, retain this relation between regeneration and justification.

When, then, did the change come by which we have now two definitions of regeneration, a new one being added? We believe it is to be found in the beginning of the present century, at the time of revival from the cold rationalism of the last century. We believe, further, that it is first to be recognized in that man, whose support of a theological idea is not always a recommendation for it to Lutherans, but from whom much of the present day theology has come—Schleiermacher. Certainly the present advocates of this second definition (C) of regeneration have discarded the dangerous Roman Catholic elements (that is, the tendency to the doctrine of the gratia infusa in justification) in Schleiermacher's teaching, but yet the origin from him can still be recognized. Let the following be compared with the passages from authors before quoted and this will become evident. They constitute parts of Schleiermacher's teach-

ing, as gathered from his Glaubenslehre, I, 2, §106–112. They are quoted from Philippi (V, 1, 186 ff.).

"Schleiermacher distinguishes between the act of the union of man with God and the state of the continuing union, or between regeneration and sanctification. Regeneration, as the fact of being taken up into a living communion with Christ, consists of conversion and justification. * * With the new life of conversion the justification of the man is established of itself, and just therein consists the subjective, mystical principle of Schleiermacher's teaching concerning the order of salvation. Justification is the divine activity, whereby the man is placed into connection with the Christ. * * Like conversion, justification consists also of two parts, the forgiveness of sins and adoption. * * The forgiveness of sins is also carried over into the consciousness of freedom from guilt. * * The consciousness of guilt ceases when through and with faith the living communion with Christ has commenced. * * Schleiermacher's doctrine of sanctification stands in the closest connection with his doctrine of regeneration; sanctification is only the gradual working out of regeneration."

The modern dogmaticians who adopt definition C of regeneration, seem merely to have separated from Schleiermacher's definition of justification all that is subjective (leaving the true Lutheran objectivity of justification), and to have called these subjective elements, after some further modifications, regeneration. With this agrees what Luthardt, himself following this definition, says (Dogmatik, p. 294) concerning Schleiermacher: He confused justification with regeneration and sanctification, and, as a rule, he considered faith as justifying only in so far as it is a new ethical principle.

Thus, after Schleiermacher, we find the two streams in the Lutheran Church, one following definition A, according to the old dogmaticians; the other adopting definition C, which had its origin in Schleiermacher, but now contains none of his Roman Catholic error.

Representative Lutheran dogmaticians of this century can be found supporting both definitions. Upholding definition C there

are such men as Thomasius, Luthardt, Martensen; and Valentine in America. Upholding definition A there are such men as Philippi, Frank, Sartorious, Zöckler; in America, Jacobs and Gerberding; further, the General Synod Catechism places regeneration before justification, although its definitions do not clearly decide the matter.

Thus we have a brief review of the history and present condition of the question. Where shall we take our stand? For which definition shall we decide? This is the question which every Lutheran student is compelled to answer. As a conscientious seeker for the truth, he dare not hastily place himself upon one side or the other. He must prayerfully seek, being sure that he shall find, for "if any of you lacketh wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all liberally and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him. But let him ask in faith, nothing doubting."

In our lengthy quotations from authors upholding definition C, we have presented the argument for that definition. (Further quotations are given below). The quotation from Thomasius presents it with particular clearness and force. The counter argument for definition A remains to be presented. Then the choice between the two will be open for everybody. It may as well be said here that our study has led us to decide in favor of definition A. We propose, therefore, to advance a double argument: 1, Negative, as against definition C; 2, Positive, as favoring definition A.

1. Negative. All that the supporters of definition C place under regeneration belongs in part to faith, in part to the mystical union, in part to sanctification. They claim that there is need of a new life principle in man. They seek a further inner change in man, before sanctification begins. Such inner change as has taken place in the change from unbelief to faith is not yet sufficient. They recognize faith as being the principle of a new life, but faith is not creative. It is receptive or surrendering only. Therefore, inasmuch as, with justification, the Holy Spirit gains new power over the man, he fills faith with positive powers, potentiates it, brings that beginning of spiritual life

planted in baptism unto maturity, works in man the gracious power of living a new spiritual life, effects the change from a wrong to a right principle of living, thus creating the new man. This is regeneration.

Thus, we see that they assert the need of a change in man more deep going than that which has taken place in the change from unbelief to faith; which change cannot, however, be called sanctification. They seek a deepening of the conversio, as Thomasius would say, or a deepening of the effect of the call, as Valentine would say (for he places conversion, along with regeneration, after justification). They ask for a new principle of life. We claim, however, that faith itself is that principle. No, they say, faith is not creative. Taking, not giving, is its nature. As answer to this, let only the following Scripture passages be read. Gal. 5 : 6: "Faith, which worketh by love;" Gal. 2 : 20: "The life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God who loved me;" 1 John 5 : 4 and 5: "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God;" James 2 : 20: "Faith without works is dead;" as well as the whole teaching of both Paul and James. Other passages might be mentioned. See also the innumerable passages in our symbols as well as in Luther's writings, which speak of the active power of faith. Take, for instance, the well known words of Luther: "Oh, this faith is a busy, living, active, efficacious thing, so that it is impossible for it not incessantly to do good works. It does not ask whether good works are to be done, but before the question has been asked, it has already done them, and is always doing them." (Introduction to Paul's Epistle to the Romans).

What other life principle do we need? What other thoroughgoing, pervading power is lacking? The whole change took place when the man became a believer. However, Thomasius himself uses some of those Scripture passages in indicating the work of faith. But, he goes on to say (p. 469 ff.): "Nevertheless, the new life of the Christian cannot be derived from the nature of faith *alone*, least of all in the way in which it is generally

expressed: Justifying faith begets from itself love and this love, born of faith, produces sanctification. For, although it is true that faith forms the (subjective) means for the new life in love, yet it is in no way the creative source thereof; this, according to the Scriptures, is the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Christ: John 6 : 63, etc. * * The reception of this Spirit occurs, according to the teaching of the Apostle Paul, * * midway between justification by faith (the adoptio) and the new life. As justifying faith, however, was the human organ for justification, so it is also for this divine bestowment of the Spirit, and in so far the medium for the new life. * * The bestowment itself, however, considered as active, or, which is just the same, the primary activity of this Spirit of Christ in the believer we call * * regeneration."

There is, doubtless, no one who would care to claim that the new life of the Christian could be developed from faith *alone.* The faith of the best of Christians is a weak, puny thing compared with what it should be. Our way through this world runs beside snares and pitfalls innumerable, while our "adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." The Holy Spirit certainly must and does enter into us in new power. But what is this special new entering of his of which Thomasius speaks? It is not only his coming, as one person of the Trinity, but it is the entrance of the whole Godhead; dogmatically speaking, it is that unbreakable, incomprehensible mystical union. Thus our faith has the divine support, underneath us are "the everlasting arms," and now we, with God's help, in our majestic position as "workers together with him," may go on growing in holiness of life; again dogmatically speaking, sanctification progresses, as a joint work of God and man. Thomasius, indeed, has a place for the mystical union, but he places it, as we have seen in our first quotation from him, after all this which he calls regeneration. Thus, according to him, there is still another entrance of the Holy Spirit in new power in this mystical union. Then, too, he has sanctification after.

Now, we ask frankly, is any believer conscious of such steps,

or does our Bible warrant us in such endless divisions. Yet Thomasius says the completed fact of this regeneration enters the light of consciousness. We think not. In our faith we know, from the promises of God, that we have received the adoption of children, we know that the mystical union has taken place; and then our faith (the human side) and the Holy Spirit (the divine side) go on working out the progress of sanctification. There is nothing more needed, nothing else takes place. Faith *is* an active, creative power, if only God be with us to strengthen its weakness. What these writers include in regeneration belongs to faith, the mystical union and sanctification.

The strange fact in Thomasius' whole argument is that he really admits in the end what we have just claimed. For see on page 471 of his work how, as he comes face to face with those Scripture texts which speak of baptism as regenerating, he, with his definition of regeneration, cannot put the same construction upon them as upon other texts which speak of the word as regenerating. He must use regeneration in two senses. Therefore he says: "If this double use of the same word seems suspicious, we can place renovatio here instead of regeneratio, for that would be just as scriptural." But renovatio is the same for him as sanctificatio (468, bottom of page). Thus it is also for all those who follow definition c.

After carefully examining the works of these writers, one cannot avoid the thought that their whole method of arrangement is actuated by the desire to keep from asserting baptismal regeneration in children boldly and firmly. They do all assert it, but under limiting conditions that seem almost to take away all that has been given. It is not our province here to discuss the questions of child faith, etc. We would only say that, since the Bible which all Christians have and read speaks clearly of baptismal regeneration, if our definition of regeneration will not allow us to assert it just as clearly, then it is time we changed our definition. These authors fear the dreaded Roman Catholic doctrine of an opus operatum in baptismal regeneration. But every Scylla has its Charybdis. As said before, these authors

have discarded the errors of Schleiermacher on justification, that very centre of our theology. But some of their sentences, when torn from their connection, have a slight tendency which would seem to indicate that, in avoiding the Roman Catholic opus operatum, extreme cautiousness must be exercised in order to keep from crashing upon the far more dangerous Roman Catholic gratia infusa. Note the following: "The entrance of justification is directly accompanied by a radical change of the inner attitude of the human personality towards God." "God does not forgive, without giving." "This is therefore a deepening of the conversio through the agency of justification by faith." "This regeneration occurs in time along with justification; it is *the subjective correlate of the event* which occurs in that moment, when faith has attained unto a real grasp of the grace of Christ."

Thus we complete our negative argument, as against definition C. Now, let us present the positive argument, as favoring definition A.

2. Positive. Having denied the possibility of regeneration being considered as in accordance with definition C, it is necessary to place it somewhere else. The word is in our Bible and in our theology. What is it to which we must give this name? The very word itself, in its etymology, gives us a clue. We no not mean, however, to force too closely the analogy of a birth. But it is evident that the term regeneration, "born again," must indicate that change within a man which is decisive, which is of highest importance, which places the man above all else in contrast with what he was before it took place. The whole idea of the word demands that it shall mark some such radical change in a man. Now, where is this change? Well, what is it which divides the whole world into two great classes? What are the ordinary words by which we indicate the difference between these two classes? Are they not those two words, which not only the theologian, but everybody uses—believers and unbelievers? Then belief, faith, is the important, decisive thing. In this Thomasius himself stands with us, for read again his words: "Faith was the decisive turning point in his life; it is the great ethical act of turning away from the old, natural aliena-

tion from God to the God of salvation, a really new attitude of the human ego." What then should bear the name of regeneration (since all agree that regeneration is a work of the Holy Spirit,) if not that work of the Holy Spirit by which a man is brought to faith? Man of himself cannot believe; that is the *greatest* weakness of our nature; "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, for they are spiritually discerned;" "No man can come to me," said Jesus, "except the Father which hath sent me draw him." What is the object of all our preaching? Truly, it is to build up those who are already believers; but is it not also, even above and beyond that, to bring the unbeliever to belief? Is it not in order that faith may come by hearing? Is it not in order that the Holy Spirit, going with that word, may overpower man's weakness and stubbornness, and bring him to faith? Is that not the place where above all else we can say regeneration is necessary? Is it not at that point that a change takes place which is comparable with the change from death to life? Then that is regeneration; that is the new birth. Man by nature has not the desire for the things of God. Though in civil affairs his will is free, yet he has no freedom of will to choose the way of life. His nature is corrupted, and there is no inclination in him to follow God's will in the matter of salvation. He simply cannot do it, until the Holy Spirit awakens the desire, then grants the power to the helpless will, and then urges the man to follow the desire and use the renewed power given to the will. This is surely regeneration, this restoration to a man of that which was last in the fall. Man, as originally created, had true desires, full freedom of will and confidence in God; but they were lost in the fall. Now, when these are restored to man by the Holy Spirit through the means of grace, is that not a regeneration, a new birth? Yes, above all else, this deserves that name. Our Christian consciousness assures us of this, and we shall shortly see that the Scriptures do also assure us of it. But that agrees with definition A: Regeneration is that work of God, the Holy Spirit, in an indi-

vidual, after the illuminating call, by which he is brought to faith in Jesus Christ.

It is true that the supporters of definition c recognize the need of such an activity of the Spirit before faith can be effected, but they call it something else—something else, which, it seems to us, does not fit that which has been accomplished. Dr. Valentine includes that activity of the Spirit principally under the call. But it seems to us that no such great activity can be properly included in the call. The call has its province rather in opening up the truth of the word to the dull mind, which cannot otherwise understand spiritual things. It shows man his need and his utter inability to save himself. Further than that we can hardly include anything under our ideas of what a call is. Its purpose is to illuminate, to bring light unto the darkened soul, to show that soul its hope; but the realization of that hope, the granting of the power to attain it, is something else, it is regeneration. Dr. Valentine is compelled to explain this truth by adding an adjective to the noun "call," and speaking of it as the *efficient* call. Of course, these two activities of the Spirit are bound closely together and always occur together, but from the nature of the names "call" and "regeneration" we must make the distinction. Further, we shall see later that the Scriptures place regeneration, as well as the call, before justification. This necessitates such a division. The other advocates of definition c place conversion (same as repentance) before justification (Dr. Valentine includes conversion with regeneration and places both after justification, leaving repentance alone with the call before justification); they include this activity of the Holy Spirit, which we think is rightly regeneration, under conversion. However, according to the Scriptures, regeneration and conversion (or repentance) are practically but two sides of the same thing. "Conversion, when distinguished from regeneration is the impulse given the regenerated will by the Holy Spirit, and its consequent activity in turning from sin to God. Conversion and repentance are, from the scriptural standpoint, synonymous." (Jacobs' "Elements of Religion," p. 181).

We believe that thus we have shown the incorrectness of de-

finition C and the correctness of definition A. However, the argument has been, in the main, from our Christian consciousness. That is not sufficient. It remains to be shown that the Scriptures uphold what Christian consciousness approved. But, before doing so, we would turn once more to Luther and the symbols of our Church. We have previously stated that in neither Luther's writings nor the symbols is a settled definition of regeneration given. However, there are some very strong indications that Calovius and those after him did not, without some development going on before them, reach their definition of the term, which agrees with our definition A. In other words, we hope to show that there was a tendency already in Luther's writings and in the symbols to give regeneration such a meaning. We believe that the prevailing, though no doubt hazy, notion in the minds of those men of the early days of our Church agreed with definition A.

As for Luther, we go no further than to quote the following from that great authority on Luther's life and theology, Koestlin. He says in his "Luther's Theologie," vol. II, p. 448 (2nd edit.), after having quoted several passages from Luther: "Regeneration, to which we are thus carried over by the nature of justification, occurs, according to the passages quoted, through faith. At other times Luther generally includes in the idea also the production (das werden) itself of faith, worked by God: we are born anew of God by the Holy Spirit, when he engenders faith and thus new God-pleasing thoughts, an entirely new heart, a new man, within them, by a persistent and contiued mortification of the old man, must preserve itself and grow, until at last the whole body be renewed. Also, since he in reality sees the whole new life enclosed in faith, he explains with directness: the divine birth is nothing else than faith itself." (Luther's Works, Erlangen edit., 46 : 260ff., 267, 269f., 275ff.; 12 : 386ff., 404ff.; 10 : 206f.; 4 : 178, 184f.). In these words of Luther we see the explanation of all the apparent differences in his writings concerning regeneration. We see also that at bottom rested an idea in accordance with definition A. That explanation of Luther's position applies, we believe, to every one

of the early writers of our Church and, in consequence, to the symbols. They looked upon faith as the great, living, new power implanted in man. Their idea of regeneration was at bottom that it is the activity of the Holy Spirit in producing faith. But, since faith brings justification and is also the power which, with the Holy Spirit's help, develops the new man, they spoke of regeneration in wider senses, as including justification, or the beginning of sanctification, or the whole of sanctification, etc.

We turn to the symbols of our Church.* Of course, as we have said, there are here the various definitions; and even the Formula of Concord, when it speaks of them (572 : 18ff.), does not itself give us a sure ground for deciding in favor of either definition A or C, or any definition, as its view. Hunting through the book, we find definitions which would seem to support those who favor C. We quote the firmest and best that we have found. 129, 135: "The law cannot be observed, unless we have been regenerated by faith in Christ;" 144, 194: "Before we observe the law, our hearts must be born again by faith;" 104, 4: "Because indeed faith brings the Holy Ghost, and produces in hearts a new life, it is necessary that it should produce spiritual movements in hearts. * * Therefore, when we have been justified by faith and regenerated, we begin to fear and love God, etc.;" 156, 253: "Regeneration occurs, by faith, in repentance;" 542, 14: "Regeneration and renewal of the Holy Ghost, which, nevertheless, is only begun in this life, but will at length be fully completed in the life to come." See also 565, 65; 509, 4. We believe that all of them can be explained, however, as Luther's differences are explained by himself above. This will become particularly evident upon an examination of the following quotations, favoring definition A, which are so much clearer than those favoring definition C. In the Augsburg Confession, the symbol above all others of the Lutheran Church, compare Article II with Article V. Article II says: "Born again by Baptism and the Holy Spirit;" Article V: "For the obtaining of this faith, the ministry of teaching the Gospel, and

*All quotations are from Dr. Jacobs' edition of the Book of Concord.

administering the sacraments was instituted. For by the word and sacraments, as by instruments, the Holy Spirit is given; who worketh faith." The natural result of the comparison is that the "obtaining of this faith" is equivalent to being "born again," for both are placed as being produced by the same agency, the Holy Spirit in baptism. We do not see how any other inference is possible without doing violence to both the letter and spirit of that which is stated. In the Apology, look first at 94, 61: "We must declare *how faith is attained*," and then 65: "For what more simple and more clear can be said concerning the conversion of the wicked, or concerning *the mode of regeneration*," and finally 95, 68: "We have said these things thus far, in order that we might show *the mode of regeneration*." Are not the words we have emphasized put here as equivalents? An examination of the whole context, will, we think, show this to be so. But see the following passages, where there is no need of a comparison. 560, 44: "Therefore here there is no co-operation of our will in the conversion of man, and man must be *born anew of God;* otherwise the thought of turning one's self to the Holy Gospel *for the purpose of accepting it* cannot arise in our hearts." 564, 60: "God the Lord draws the man whom he wishes to convert, and draws him, too, in such a way that his understanding, in place of darkened, becomes enlightened, and his will, in place of perverse, becomes obedient. And the Scriptures call this '*creating a new heart*' (Ps. 51 : 10)." What fuller, clearer statement of what we have given as regeneration could be asked for? 500, 18: "God's Spirit through the heard word or the use of the holy sacrament, lays hold upon man's will, and *works* (in man) *the new birth* and conversion. For if (after) the Holy Ghost has wrought and accomplished this and man's will has been changed and renewed alone by his divine power and working, then the new will of man is an instrument and organ of God, the Holy Ghost, *so that he* not only *accepts grace*, but also, in the works which follow, coöperates with the Holy Ghost." See also 85, 12; 186, 58; 499, 17; 552, 7; 563, 55. But there is another and neglected fact in the symbols' use of the terms regeneration, regenerate, unregener-

ate, born again, etc., to which attention needs to be called. If one will but take an index to the symbols and look over all passages relating to the subject, he will find that that subject is dealt with almost exclusively in connection with those parts which concern the free will, or human power; in other words, with those parts which concern man's inability of himself to turn to God in faith. A moment's thought must convince every one that this general view of the teaching of the symbols concerning regeneration is a weighty argument for the claim that their real teaching upon regeneration favors definition A.

And now we come finally to the most important of all. What saith the Scripture? Here all words of dogmaticians, all testimony of Christian consciousness, all statements of symbols must stand their test. Does the word of the Lord teach that which we believe to have proven from other sources? If not then all those earthly things are wrong. If so, then all must bow in acknowledgment.

It is encouraging to find at the outset that all purely Biblical Theologies, written by Lutherans, which we have been able to consult, find in the Scripture our definition of regeneration. We refer to Cremer, Lechler, Nösgen and Schmidt.* Weiss is the only exception, but Weiss, with some of his beliefs, seems hardly to stand on Lutheran ground.

Let us look first at those passages which are used to support definition C. First, those passages are quoted which speak of our receiving the Holy Spirit *after* faith, who witnesses to us our adoption, *e. g.* Gal. 4 : 4–6 : "But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." Gal. 3 : 2–5 : "This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the

*Schmidt *seems*, in one or two passages of his Biblical Theology of the New Testament, to include not only the production of faith, but also justification under regeneration. In all other passages, however, he stands clearly in favor of definition A.

hearing of faith? Are ye so foolish? Having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh? * * He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" Gal. 3 : 14: "That ye might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." Rom. 5 : 1–5; 8 : 9, 10. After that, passages like the following are quoted, as denoting the regeneration which the Spirit then effects: Rom. 7 : 6: "But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of Spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter." Rom. 6 : 4: "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Eph. 4 : 23, 24; "And be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." 2 Cor. 5 : 17: "Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." Col. 3 : 10; Eph. 2 : 10.

Now certainly we do receive the Holy Spirit in new power after justification, but is not that included in the mystical union, as we said before? As for the other texts, they certainly concern sanctification and nothing else. As proof of this it is to be noticed that most of them are urgings to *us* to do something. Now, regeneration is a work of God, the Holy Spirit, in us, according to these very upholders of definition c. It is only in sanctification that *we* work, coöperating with the Holy Spirit. Thus again, the Scriptures uphold what we before claimed: All that these writers place under regeneration belongs to faith, to the mystical union, and to sanctification.

Of greatest importance is, that these authors cannot bring their Scripture passages into direct connection with such portions of the Scriptures as speak *directly* of regeneration, *e. g.* John 3 : 3 and 5; 1 Pet. 1 : 23; James 1 : 18; Titus 3 : 5; etc. When Thomasius attempts it, he is compelled to say, as we have seen before: we can use renovatio here. But renovatio is the same as sanctificatio by his own statement.

We hope to present clearly now what seems to us to be the direct, plain teaching of the Scriptures, placing regeneration *before* justification, thus making God's word the sure foundation for definition A. Before presenting our own statement, we quote from Cremer's "Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuchder Neutestamentlichen Gräcität (8th Edit.), p. 839, article πνεῦμα. After showing from the Scriptures that the congregation, and thus also the individuals are temples of the Holy Spirit, that the Holy Spirit dwells in them, he proceeds: "Corresponding to this is the necessity for the regeneration of each individual—a birth ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, John 3 : 5 : ἐὰν μὴ τις γεννηθῇ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, compare βατίζεσθαι ἐν πν. ἁγ. 1 : 33. Compare Titus 3 : 5 : ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς διὰ λούτρου παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ανακαινώσεως πνεύματος ἁγ. with v. 3: ἦμεν γάρ ποτε καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀνόητοι, κ τ λ.; as well as 1 Cor. 6, 11 : καὶ ταῦτά τινες ἦτε· ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλὰ ηγιάσθητε, ἀλλὰ ἐδικαιώθητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου $\overline{Ιυ}$ $\overline{Χυ}$ καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν. This regeneration is however thus named, because it is a deliverance of the life from destruction, from the judgment of death (compare ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς, Titus 3 : 5, and also the ζωὴ αἰώνιος as the opposite of death, John 3 : 14 and 16), and thus an appropriation of salvation, a granting of grace; not because it is a renewal (a new equipment of the religio-moral life-impulse) of the human πνεῦμα. Through the gift of the Holy Spirit, that is, through the activity of the Holy Spirit in the appropriation of salvation, the individual becomes an inmate and thus a member of the congregation of saved ones (not the reverse), etc."

Thus does Cremer briefly reach the Scripture teaching. We believe it possible to present the matter still more clearly.

We look at the Gospels first, and start with that cardinal text on regeneration, John 3 : 3 and 5 : "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. * * Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." The simple teaching of that text is that a man must be born again in order to enter the kingdom of God. There is no other meaning possible. But what is the

entrance to the kingdom of God? Is it not faith? Then that text plainly means that a man must be born again in order to have faith. There is no playing with words in that. It is a simple statement of the meaning of the text. As a consequence regeneration precedes justification, and definition A fits Jesus' words to Nicodemus. But, lest somebody might be inclined, on account of the various opinions now-a-days concerning the kingdom of God, to doubt our statement that faith is the entrance to that kingdom, let us notice that Jesus states the fact himself. The 15th and 16th verses of the same chapter state it, although they have "eternal life" instead of "the kingdom of God." So we shall seek a place where Jesus uses the same words. Mark 1 : 15 : "The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye, and believe the gospel;" Matt. 21 : 31 and 32 : "Jesus saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, that the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you. For John came unto you in the way of righteousness and ye believed him not; but the publicans and the harlots believed him; and ye, when ye had seen it, repented not afterward, that ye might believe him;" Matt. 18 : 3 and 6 : "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. * * But whoso shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me." In the last two quotations it is necessary only to combine the two verses to see the fact that faith is the entrance to the kingdom. See also Matt. 3 : 2 and 4 : 17, which really teach the same thing. Two passages in the Gospels might seem to oppose what we have shown. Matt. 2 : 20 : "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." Matt. 7 : 21 : "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which in heaven." But they suddenly become most sturdy upholders thereof, when we compare them with the following three. John 6 : 29 and 40 : "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent. * * This is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son,

and believeth on him, may have everlasting life." 1 John 3 : 23: "And this is his commandment, That ye should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ," etc.

We have thus a clear view of our Lord's teaching concerning the matter. We must be born again in order to believe. The consequence is that for Jesus regeneration precedes justification.

Now let us turn to the Apostles and see how they teach directly in accordance with these words of Jesus. We turn to John first, as the one who records these words of Jesus to Nicodemus, and who perhaps heard the conversation. In one sentence he gives us the whole truth. 1 John 5 : 1 : "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." That "is born" is in the perfect tense in the original, γεγέννηται. There is the same presentation that Jesus gave. It is necessary to be born again in order to believe. To avoid any possible misunderstanding, John gives us the same idea in the 4th and 5th verses: "For whatsoever is born (perfect tense again) of God overcometh the world; and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God."

We turn to Paul and the other apostles. Look first at the statements: Rom. 10 : 17: "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Gal. 3 : 2 and 5 : "Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? * * * He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" Compare those with the following. 1 Cor. 4 : 15 : "For in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the Gospel." James 1 : 18: "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth." 1 Pet. 1 : 23: "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God." Here Paul and the other apostles place, on the one hand, the receiving of the Spirit and, through him, faith as the effect of the proclamation of the word; on the other hand, they place regeneration as the effect. Is there any reason why we should not understand them to mean the same thing in both cases? The Holy Spirit regenerates a man through the word;

the Holy Spirit brings a man to faith through the word. And then the apostles give the same result for baptism, which is the visible word or the individualized word. Titus 3 : 5 : "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost;" and once more John 3 : 5 : "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit."

Surely we have their meaning aright. Consequently, since here again we find regeneration to be that activity of the Holy Spirit by which a man is brought to faith, and since there must be faith before justification takes place, regeneration precedes justification.

It would be wonderful if the orderly and logical Paul did not at some place give us a hint of his view of the process through which an individual passes in the "appropriation of salvation." We do find it especially in two passages, and it seems to us to be no forcing of his words when we interpret him as placing regeneration before justification. They are these. Titus 3 : 5–8: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us (the whole process) by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life. This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works." It is a summary, which he writes to Titus at the end of the letter. But see also Acts 26 : 18, where he tells Agrippa the work that the Lord gave him to do among the Gentiles: "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light (the illuminating call), and from the power of Satan unto God (regeneration), that they may receive forgiveness of sins (justification) and inheritance among them which are sanctified (sanctification) by faith that is in me." The order seems unmistakable there. He states something before justification which may well be called regeneration, but after it he has nothing which we can so name.

And so we have completed our presentation of the teaching of the Scriptures on the subject. We believe that we have made it manifest that the proper definition of regeneration is A: Regeneration is that work of God, the Holy Spirit, in an individual, after the illuminating call, by which he is brought to faith in Jesus Christ. In our Lutheran system regeneration should precede justification.

ARTICLE III.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE MINISTRY.*

By G. U. Wenner, D. D.

There is a view of the ministry which makes its holder a preacher, but confers upon him no authority, entrusts to his stewardship no objective realities, has no mysteries for him to handle. Over against this view we are confronted in our day with the revival of an ancient superstition which separates the minister from the general body of Christians and imputes to him powers for which we seek in vain in Scripture or in the constitution of the Church. And yet the unquestioned success that characterizes the Tractarian movement, with its singular mixture of truth and error, its undoubted hold upon the religious life of the hardheaded and practical Englishman, man, can be accounted for only by the dearth among its neighbors of a doctrine of the ministry that will adequately answer certain important religious questions. The widespread and insidious character of this superstition is very remarkable. The high-church Anglicans are not the only ones addicted to it. The veriest Congregationalist or Baptist among us loves to call himself a "clergyman." He speaks of his unordained brother as a "layman," and looks down upon him as one that knoweth not the law. It may be pleaded that these are only terms of accommodation and are not to be taken seriously. But a close observation of the opinions of men compels us to believe that

*Prepared by request of the Synod of New York and New Jersey.

underneath these expressions there lies a vicious and unscriptural view of the ministry, which, to say the least, cannot be promotive of spirituality. Striking as is the contrast between these two views of the ministry, we frequently find them lying peacefully side by side, not merely in the minds of the ordinary members of our churches, but of the ministers themselves. For this reason a little elementary study of the subject may not be out of place. The question is not simply theoretical. It has a practical bearing upon the fruitfulness of our work which entitles it to a claim upon our attention.

I have a faint recollection of having once visited a place where the royal regalia were kept and exhibited to visitors. There was a crown and a scepter and a multitude of precious stones. I asked the custodian whether there was no danger of these valuable things being stolen. "None whatever," said he, "These are only imitations. The real treasures are locked up."

There are high-churchmen who appear before us with all the paraphernalia of office, holy robes and priestly claims. But we would like to see their credentials before we admit their authority, and we are especially interested in knowing whether the gifts they offer are genuine.

There are low-churchmen, dissenters of various kinds, who repudiate the uniform and the terminology of sacerdotalism, but who realize that they are called upon to prove the validity of their ministry. They emphasize the personal element and make much of preaching. When the interest flags, the evangelist is called in, and with feverish energy the services are multiplied. But when you ask them what they have to offer, the answer is not always satisfactory. "Have you the power of the keys?" "Not at all. God only can forgive transgressions." "Will this water wash away sins?" "By no means. Is it only a symbolical act." "Will this bread feed me? Is it really a sacrament?" "How dare you think so? It is simply a memorial feast, and if you come in true devotion and are sufficiently well prepared, doubtless you will be benefited by your act of worship." "Is there any danger that these treasures will be stolen?" Not at all. These are only imitations. The real ones are locked up.

In the New Testament we have no such term as cleric as applied to a distinct class in the Church. In this respect the New Testament differs altogether from the Old Testament. In the Old Testament we find an established order, and if there had been any warrant whatever in the New Testament for such a class, how readily it would have been adopted by a Church which had all its roots in the Old Testament and which clung so tenaciously to the traditions of the past, that whatever of the old dispensation could be used in the new was eagerly transferred. But in the new dispensation the whole Church was the κλῆρος. The term spiritual as distinguished from the natural or secular is applied to the whole congregation of believers who were separated from the world in the new life of faith. It is of the whole Church that St. John speaks when he says (1, 2 : 27,): "The chrism which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you:" The Lord's words unto Moses: "Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation," (Ex. 19 : 6,) Peter applied not to a special class or order but to the whole Church when he wrote, "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvelous light." 1 Pet. 2 : 9.

The first to receive a special ministry were the apostles, and to them was given not only special *authority*, but also special *power*. As the founders of the Church, the immediate followers of the Lord, they were endued with special gifts.

On the day of Pentecost, the Spirit was poured out upon all; all were endued with gifts and there was no difference among them with respect to order or class. Subsequently certain individuals were set apart for the various offices of the Church in accordance with the charismata which they possesed. Their inner fitness constituted the basis of the external call which was extended by the Church. But it by no means followed that those who were not appointed to the ministry of the word were excluded from that ministry, as the cases of Philip and Stephen plainly show.

The directions of the Master included the proclamation of the word: "Teaching them to observe all things;" the administration of the sacraments, "Baptizing them in the name of the Father," "This do in remembrance of me;" and the power of the keys, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth." The administration of this inheritance made it necessary that certain ones should be selected who should exercise the duties of an office which came into existence from the nature of the duties that were to be performed.

They were set apart for their work by an act of intercessory prayer in which, by the laying on of hands, the individual application of the prayer was symbolized. It was done for the sake of the decency and order which were the underlying principles of the early worship. But while they were thus publicly authorized and set apart for a special ministry, nowhere do we read that any special power or gift was bestowed upon them by this act. The only passage that seems to contradict this statement is that of 1 Timothy 4 : 14: "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of hands of the presbytery." But it will be observed in this case that the gift was given not by the *laying on of hands* but by *prophecy*, διὰ προφητείας) and that it was *with*, and not *by*, the laying on of hands. The preposition is μετὰ and not διὰ.

Such passages as that of Acts 13, the separation of Barnabas and Saul for the work to which they had been called, are sometimes quoted in favor of the exclusive authority of those who ordained them, but what evidence is there here of sacramental grace conferred by ordination, or of any authority independent of the Church. The management of the office of the ministry in the New Testament was nothing else than the administration of the means of grace. That was the object of the office, and that was the condition on which it existed. Whatever power they had, was not given to them personally but to the whole Church.

To sum up, the New Testament view was that the office was based on the means of grace, and not the means of grace on the

office. The means of grace were efficacious in themselves, because of the institution of Christ, and not by virtue of their administration by certain selected individuals.

The exegesis which makes a priestly order of the New Testament ministry is of a kind which declares that the cloak which Paul left at Troas was a clerical gown and that the parchments were the original manuscript of the liturgy of the Church.

The tendency that finally led to the adoption of a sacerdotal idea of the ministry finds its doctrinal exponent and representative in Cyprian. But the real sources of the doctrine lie deeper than the theological utterances of any individual. The Church had begun to conform to the world and to be entangled with heathen practices and ideals. There was a decline of spiritual power and of a world-conquering faith. The general average of the Christian life had come to a lower level. The result of such a condition was that the more earnest believers were driven into the seclusion and complacency of a private and subjective Christianity, which in course of time made them preëminently *the* religious people, and their way of living came to be called the religious life, as contrasted with the secular or worldly life which the rest, the nominal Christians led. This was the origin of the sharp distinction that was drawn between the clerics and laymen, a distinction which modern clerics of all classes continue to encourage, and which the laymen meekly accept, if for no other reason than that it absolves them from some of the higher ideals to which their baptismal covenant commits them.

The next step was the Cyprianic idea of the priesthood, according to which the clergy were the mediators between God and man, and without the mediation of the clergy there could be no access to him. This was the foundation of the Romish idea and is its distinctive heresy to this day. Finally the theory of the apostolical succession had to be invented, with which to bolster up the authority of the priests. The legitimacy of their office was assured by it, and under it the Church dragged along till the days of the Reformation.

The Reformation repudiated first of all the idea of any mediation except that of Christ. It could therefore not accept the

prevalent doctrine of the ministry. Nevertheless, for the sake of order, Luther was willing to retain the existing episcopal government, provided the bishops would accept the Gospel. Four of them did so, and they were retained in office to the end of their lives. Even Hermann, the archbishop of Koeln was for forty years a Lutheran minister, and his famous cathedral was a Lutheran house of worship. But where the bishops as a body did not accept the Gospel, Luther proposed to do away with the whole system rather than lose one particle of evangelical freedom. Only in Scandinavia, because of the conversion of the entire country, was the episcopal system retained, without however attributing to it sacerdotal powers or a divine right in the distinction of orders. While there are bishops and prelates, superintendents and general superintendents in the Lutheran Church, these distinctions exist simply *jure humano.* As pastors or ministers of the Church, all stand upon an equality, and possess equal rights. For example no bishop would think of entering the church of the humblest pastor for the purpose of administering the rite of confirmation. The term "priest" was used in some of our earlier books and is still to be found in the Scandinavian prayer books, and in the popular usage of some of our northern provinces, but it is used only in the sense of "presbyter writ short." In the sense of Ἱερεὺς it is never used.

The position of the conservative Reformation, as explained in the Augustana and other symbolical books of the Lutheran Church, may be briefly stated as follows: To the Church have been given the means of grace in the special sense, that is, the word of God and the sacraments. To these may be added the power of the keys, or the authority for a personal and individual application of the promises of the Gospel. The means are efficacious in themselves, and not by virtue of their being administered by the members of a certain class or order. The *mandatum Christi* has made them efficacious. While all Christians are equal, as members of the body of Christ, the administration of the means requires the appointment of certain persons to act as ministers. As Luther says: "If the whole congregation should attempt to baptize the child, it would be in danger

of being drowned. The authority of the ministry comes not from a certain class in the Church, but from the Church itself. Hence no one should exercise the ministry unless he has been properly called. These three words, *nisi rite vocatus*, are what make Lutherans so reluctant to admit anybody and everybody, male or female, to the pulpit. Of grades in the ministry there is but one. These are Scriptural principles and are throughout in harmony with what we have already seen are the teachings of the New Testament on this subject.

But while these principles are sound, truth compels us to make confession of our weakness in the application of these principles. The external exigencies of the Reformation period brought about an unfortunate alliance with the state through the acceptance of the princes as protectors of the Church. In the State Church an abnormal and illogical position was given to the pastor. Hence while we got rid of the pope and the priest, we had almost as heavy a load to carry in the overruling influence of the pastor, subject to the influence of the secular authority. This state of things led to two evils. In the first place it interfered with the development of congregational life. In this respect our brethren of the Reformed Churches both in Great Britain and on the continent are ahead of us. In the second place there has been a decadence of the other offices of the Church.

This is an evil which is common however to all Protestant Churches. When we read of the great variety of offices of the early Church, corresponding to the *charismata* which they enjoyed, how poor our constitution appears as compared with theirs. Elders and deacons we still have, nominally at least. But where are the evangelists, (the local, not the ambulatory)? Where are our subdeacons and acolytes, our lectors and cantors and catechists? The presence of these implied a highly organized society, and hence a higher form of life. In place of these purely churchly offices, what are the substitutes of the Protestant Church? There is a preacher, frequently hired by the year, or a stated supply, and a sexton. For the management of the property there is a secular body of trustees

a non-churchly corporation, an organ of the state, and not necessarily working in harmony with the regular ministry of the Church. For aiding the worship of the Church, we sometimes hear of hired quartets who sing well but pray little.

In view of such conceded defects we shall doubtless all agree that there remains to be written an important chapter of Protestant Church Polity on the development of an articulated ministry in our local churches, interdependent and coöperative, laboring together in various churchly relations for the extension of Christ's kingdom. There is an atrophy of our organized church life that prevents our boasting before Roman Catholics that we believe in the universal priesthood. The new ministry which has been suggested, is one that should utilize to the last degree the gifts and graces of all our members. Two offices certainly might be restored at once with little difficulty to many churches, that of the deaconess and that of the lector, or as he is termed in modern times, the lay reader or local preacher. Already in many places these have proved to be most helpful agencies.

I have stated the conservative Protestant view of the ministry as it is found in the Lutheran symbols. Over against this doctrine there exists what we may term the ultra Protestant view. But for a clear statement concerning it, I have looked in vain in the Reformed symbols and in their doctrinal systems. In order to understand it, as it appears in their preaching and in their practical work, we must recall the fundamental principles of the church life of these two representatives of Protestantism. The conservative emphasizes the *sacramental* character of the means of grace. He believes that through them the benefits of Christ's work are actually transmitted to the Church and that by them the Ascended One will himself be present with us always even unto the end of the world. The radical on the other hand emphasizes the *sacrificial* character of the means of grace, (if indeed with Zwingli, *Fidei Ratio*,) he does not deny altogether the existence or need of means of grace. For him preaching is purely a human production, an evidence of faith, a sacrifice. The Lord's Supper is a memorial feast,—we manifest our faith and Christian fellowship by celebrating it. There is nothing in

baptism, so far as any objective benefit to the baptized person is concerned. And of course, apart from their value as means of social discipline, none of them believe in the Keys.

With such a barren view of the means of grace, eliminating from the very institutions of Christ the Divine causality, is it any wonder that within the ranks of the Reformed Church itself there should have sprung up a protest against it. Unfortunately, the pendulum swung too far, and we have witnessed in our day the sad spectacle of a revival of Cyprianism. The exalted personal character of its early advocates, and the recognized defects of the Protestant system aided its progress. Many otherwise masculine intellects have been carried away by the glamour of priestly power and a restoration of catholic institutions.

It is not too much to say that the Tractarian theory of an unbroken galvanic current from the apostles to the present time is as puerile as it is improbable. Making the means of grace dependent upon the ritual legitimacy of the administrator, it robs them of the Divine character which alone entitles them to a permanent place in the life of the Church.

In justice to the Church in which this theory has been developed, it is only right to say that while up to the time of the recent unpleasantness with the pope, the sacerdotal party seemed to be in ascendancy, its doctrines are not those of the Church of England. Hooker, in his Ecclesiastical Polity (7, 14) admits that there may be ordination without a bishop, and in making this admission he concedes the whole question. Leading Tractarians have made the same admission. And the history of the Church of England shows over and over again that they were willing to receive the entire Presbyterian body without reordination.

I regret the necessity of having had to say these things in criticism of a party which has stood for some positive truths, and which possesses qualities that appeal to the sympathy of every catholic churchman. If the Church of England could only be persuaded to rid herself of her sacerdotal heresy, discard the present compromise Prayer Book, and return to the Prayer Book of Edward the Sixth, we would gladly assign to

her her old place as a worthy daughter of the Church of the Reformation. All would be forgiven.

The Lutherans agree with the Reformed that the congregation is the source of authority and hence they repudiate all claims of a sacerdotal or mediatorial character. They hate them with a perfect hatred. But believing that the office is endued with divine gifts, actual means of grace, channels of divine favor and of the gifts of the Holy Ghost, they invest it with a dignity and an authority of which the Reformed system has no conception. Such a doctrine imposes it is true an added responsibility, but it gives also a sense of power to the minister, for he is literally the herald and messenger of the King.

We cannot close our eyes to an important fact that has been revealed in the discussion of this doctrine. There are two kinds of Christianity. The one is based upon a lofty conception of the dignity of human nature. It has a high ethical purpose, and it finds in Christ a noble example of all that is true and beautiful and good. Into what is essentially a sublimated Greek religion it has introduced some of the Christian terms and ceremonies. But its ministers have no authoritative documents, and their proclamations have not the endorsement of the King. There is another Christianity which is the faith of the catholic church. Its ministers have an unbroken apostolical succession. They are the stewards of the divine mysteries which were committed to them in the beginning by the Master himself and which have therefore never failed to be efficacious. "Therefore seeing we have *this* ministry, even as we have obtained mercy, we faint not."

ARTICLE IV.

EVOLUTION AS TAUGHT IN SCRIPTURE.

By Rev. A. E. Deitz.

The theory of evolution is an attempt to account for the present condition of the world on scientific principles. It is a theory of development,—a theory, which teaches that the earth with everything upon it has reached its present state by a long series of advancing steps, each new age in the world's history seeing something better and higher evolved out of that which existed in the preceding age. In its extreme form the theory is atheistic, giving no place to God as Creator and acknowledging none but natural forces in the process of development. There are also theistic evolutionists, some of whom teach that God simply created the original atoms of the universe and these acting and reacting upon themselves in the course of long ages gradually developed into higher and still higher forms of existence until at last vegetable life of all kinds, animal life as exhibited in the different species, and man had all made their appearance upon the earth. Others give still larger place to God teaching that the process was not only begun but also carried on by him.

We are called upon in this paper to trace out something of what the Bible teaches about evolution.

The Scripture seems to recognize two great factors in the formation of the world, creation and development or evolution. It traces all things back to God as their origin. It looks upon him as calling some things into existence directly by his creative word; but teaches also that some things were developed or evolved out of that which already existed through second causes

Note.—The author of the above paper has felt that in the present state of scientific knowledge and of biblical interpretation this subject should not be treated in any dogmatic way. He has endeavored simply to sketch that view which has commended itself to his own judgment. Much of the thought here presented has been gathered from what he has heard and read. A. E. D.

acting under divine control. There was an act of creation to begin with, apparently too, as we shall see, other such acts at later stages of the work. There was also a process of evolution resulting, it would seem, in the production of new and higher things. But let us take the word itself. A striking passage, to begin with, is Gen. 2 : 4, which reads, "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens." The expression, "generations of the heavens and of the earth," is a remarkable one. It likens the progress of events in the formation of the world to the appearance of successive generations in a family among men, children, grandchildren and so on, descending in regular order from the original pair. Thus we are taught was the universe formed, new and perhaps somewhat modified products being brought forth out of the old.

This verse (Gen. 2 : 4) seems to fix the meaning of the term "day" as used in the account of creation, giving it the significance not of twenty-four hours but of a longer period of time; for the passage speaks of "the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens," using the word to cover the entire period during which God's work in forming the universe was going on. Necessarily taking it here to signify a period much greater than twenty-four hours, we are fully justified in understanding it to mean a long period, an age, in the first chapter of Genesis.

Still further, in this verse we are told that the heavens and the earth were *created* and yet in the same sentence it is said that God *made* them. Two terms are used, the words being different also in the Hebrew. They are both used here in a general sense, but in the first chapter of Genesis the writer seems to make a distinction between them, in each case carefully choosing between them so as to express the exact idea. To "create" is to call into existence something that did not exist before. To "make" is to produce something new by rearranging or combining materials already at hand. With this distinction in mind let us look at the first chapter of Genesis and see what light it throws upon the whole question of evolution.

This chapter gives us the connected account of the formation of the world, showing us how the work progressed by successive stages. The order of events as given here agrees in the main at least with the conclusions of the scientific world.

The chapter commences, "In the beginning" (that is in some unknown beginning, for the article is not found in the Hebrew) "God created the heavens and the earth." The whole process of world-building began then with an act of creation. God by his own will causing something to exist which before was not.

Next, the original condition of the earth is described. It was formless and void, characterized by desolateness and emptiness, a huge mass of material that needed to be arranged, combined, developed, if the globe was ever to become a suitable habitation for man. It is reasonable to suppose that immediately after the first act of creation the process of development, of evolution, began, not indeed an evolution governed only by chance, but a development provided for, watched over, by God; for "the Spirit of God moved upon (brooded over) the face of the waters." Second causes are not to be overlooked in the movement. The work was carried on no doubt through what we call natural forces but back of all that God began and ordered all.

Then we are told that God said, "Let light be and light was." It is not said that light was created, nor yet that it was made. The statement is simply that now there was light; nothing is said to indicate *how* it came to be. Inasmuch as this whole record is written in common language describing things as they would appear to an observer on the earth, perhaps those interpreters are correct who understand the passage to refer to that far-off time when the light of the sun first began to shine through the heavy mists that had enwrapped the new-born world, so that now there came to be a distinction between night and day on the earth. With this the first great age in the world's history came to an end.

On the second day, that is in the second age, we are told that God made the firmament and separated the waters below it from the waters above. Nothing new was *created* in this age, but something was *made*. The time was reached in the earth's de-

velopment when its crust, having cooled and hardened somewhat, the heavy mists around it were condensed, rains fell, and the atmosphere began to separate the waters on the earth from the thick, watery clouds above.

In the third great period of the world, a further stage was reached in the evolution of the earth. The dry land appeared and the water on the earth was gathered together in seas, or oceans. No act of creation was required for this and none is mentioned. Further, in this age vegetable life appeared. Grass and herb and tree were brought forth on the earth. And here we reach one of the points where the theory of evolution in its ordinary form is confessedly weak, if indeed it does not break down altogether. How was vegetable life produced? There are those who would have us believe that somehow living things were evolved out of that which was dead and lifeless, that somehow materials in the soil and air, which contained not a single living germ, developed themselves into plants and trees and flowers. We are asked to believe this in spite of the fact that all life of which we have any knowledge comes from life already existing. It is scientific to say that lifeless things do not bring forth living things. How then did the first life on the earth originate? How were the first trees and plants produced? The record here in Genesis is silent on that point. It says neither that God created them nor yet that he made them. It is a question for science and reason to determine. But to most minds it will seem probable at least that here there was an act of creation, God calling into existence this strange force which we call life and through it causing the earth to bring forth grass and herb and tree.

In the next great period, the fourth, we read, "And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven. And God made two great lights, one to rule the day and one to rule the night; he made the stars also." Here the word "made" is used. Something was brought about by a process of arrangement and development. Understanding the language now from the standpoint of an observer on the earth, does it not seem probable that they are right who refer the passage to that age of the world

when the thick clouds, that so far had covered the sky, began gradually to break away so that now for the first time the sun and moon and stars appeared much the same as they do to us at the present day? There certainly was such a time in the history of the earth. Referring the passage to that period, its interpretation is simple and reasonable.

In the fifth world-age, animal life appeared. And here again we come to a problem which the common theory of evolution does not reasonably solve. Animal life is different from vegetable life. Animals have sensation, the power to feel pleasure and pain. How were the first animals produced? Evolutionists would have us believe that somehow animal life was evolved out of vegetable life, that somehow things that could not feel at all developed into animals that possessed the power of feeling. Here is the second great break in the theory of evolution. But what says the Scripture? "God *created* great whales and every living creature that moveth which the waters brought forth abundantly and every winged fowl after his kind." According to this statement the process of evolution was supplemented at this point by an act of creation, God calling into existence this new force, animal life, which was to have an important place on the earth.

We pass on now to the sixth great period. And in this age we have the appearance of animals on the land; beast, cattle, and creeping thing. These it is said God "made." Were these higher animals developed from the lower, as evolution teaches? Is Mr. Darwin right in his theory as to the origin of species? Have animals of some one kind, undergoing a long process of modification, reaching on through many generations perhaps, developed at last into some new species, similar indeed to the old, yet different? There is much in the similarity of structure observed in closely-related species to support the theory. There are some strong objections to it also. Our passage says simply that God made beast, cattle, and creeping thing. It implies that nothing was here created. The new order of animals was doubtless formed out of the lower orders already existing, but how

we are not told, whether in some such manner as evolutionists teach or in some other, as yet unknown, way.

Then, last of all in this sixth age, we have the appearance of man. Evolutionists assert that man was evolved from the lower animals and point to similarity of physical structure as evidence in support of the assertion. Here is the third great point in which their theory fails to account for all the facts in the case. Between the highest animal existence below him and man there is a great gulf fixed. Man has intellect and reason very high above all mere animal intelligence. Man has self-consciousness and the power of self-determination. Man has conscience. These last are powers altogether unknown among the lower animals. They are so radically different from anything to be found in other animals that it seems impossible to believe that they are the result of any process of evolution. And just here, where the theory of evolution fails, the Scripture steps in and affirms an act of divine creation. It is well to note the exact terms used and to study all that the Scripture says. We read first, "And God said, Let us *make* man in our image." Then again, "So God *created* man in his own image; male and female *created* he them." Both terms are used. Man was *made*. Man was *created*. Going on into chapter second we read at ver. 7, "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Taking the two accounts together we are taught that man was made, formed out of something already existing so far as the body is concerned, but that man was *created* so far as the soul is concerned. It may be that man's body *was* the result of evolution. It may be that God formed it in some other way. But in either case *it* was made, but the soul was not *made*. The soul was directly created by God, who called it into existence by his own mighty word. The soul was something entirely new, different from anything that was on the earth before.

When man had thus been *made* and *created* God's work was complete, and accordingly on the seventh day, in the seventh

age, the divine Creator and Maker of all rested, ceased from the great activities in which he had been engaged.

If, now, we have been correct in our interpretation of the Scripture, then we are to look upon the world as being the result of a double process, a process of creation and evolution, these two factors jointly entering in and producing one harmonious result, each taking up what the other gave and carrying it on to something higher. The place thus assigned to evolution is no unimportant one. It began at once after the first great act of creation and continued on through all the following ages, being supplemented at two, if not at three distinct points, by new acts of creation which were required to furnish that which no process of development could produce. Evolution viewed in this way, evolution looked upon, as the method employed by God in the formation of the world, is at once both reasonable and Scriptural. It gives us a new view of the wisdom and power of God. We see God carrying on a mighty work, that advances step by step and age after age, by the most wonderful and orderly processes, until at last that which the divine mind had conceived from the first was fully wrought out; and, seeing all, we are ready to exclaim with the apostle, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments and his ways past finding out! For of him and through him and to him are all things; to whom be glory forever. Amen."

ARTICLE V.

INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES.

By J. C. Jacoby, D. D.

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." 2 Tim. 3 : 16. "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Pet. 1 : 21.

That the Bible is a wonderful book is admitted by all. And that it is given by inspiration of God is questioned only by persistent skeptics.

The inspiration of the Bible has been variously defined by different scholars as follows: "By the inspiration of Scripture we mean that special divine influence upon the minds of the Scripture writers, in virtue of which their productions, apart from errors of transcriptions, and, when rightly interpreted, constitute an infallible and sufficient rule of faith and practice." (A. H. Strong, Sys. Theol. p. 95).

"The supernatural action of the Holy Spirit on the mind of the sacred writers whereby the Scriptures were not merely their own, but the word of God." (A. R. Fausset, Bib. Cyclo. p. 308.)

"Inspiration is that divine influence by virtue of which the truths and facts given by revelation, as well as other truths and facts pertaining to God's kingdom, are spoken or written in a truthful and authoritative manner." (H. B. Smith, Int. to Chris. Theol. p. 204).

"Inspiration is the divine communication of the permanent truths of the kingdom of redemption, in an organic way, to the writers of Scripture, which gives these writers their unique place in the offices of this kingdom." (G. T. Ladd. Doc. of Sac. Script. II, 464).

In whatever form these several authors have given expression to their thoughts, but one idea predominates; namely that, "*Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.*" How these "Holy men of God" were thus moved we are not

told; nor does it matter. The great Gerhard has suggested however that these "Holy men of God" were men whom God elected and called for the express purpose of committing to writing, through them, his revelations, and that they were properly called "*the Amanuenses of God.*"

There are however several theories as to the extent and method of the inspiration of the Scriptures. The first we mention is "*the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures,*" which means that the whole letter of the Scriptures is inspired; that its words were immediately dictated by the Holy Ghost, and are literally the words of God and not of men. According to this theory, "the writers of the Bible were nothing more than the penmen of the Holy Ghost, under whose control they vibrated as the strings of the harp in the hands of the musician: They were as a piece of mechanism touched by God's own hand." Or, as another has put it, "every verse of the Bible, every word of it, every letter of it, is the direct utterance of the Most High." Another theory of inspiration is, that the writers of the Bible spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost—the Holy Ghost dictating only the thought but not the word. According to this theory the Holy Ghost so completely filled the minds of the writers with the thought to be expressed that they could not err—it was virtually and truly the mind of God expressed in words by human lips and penned by human hands. By this theory no difficulty is found in accounting for the idiosyncrasies of the respective writers. These two comprise the leading theories as to the mode and extent of the inspiration of the Scriptures. And without detaining our readers with a discussion of their relative merits, we feel inclined to give attention to the more practical side of this subject by giving some reasons for believing the truth of the Scripture, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." *Why do I believe that the Bible is inspired?* This is the important question. The declarations of the apostles at the head of this article are not mere assertions. They are stubborn facts. And now, that we may have a reason for the faith that is in us, let us think of the Bible,

I. AS AN INEXHAUSTIBLE TREASURY OF TRUTH.

John Quincy Adams once said: "In whatever light we regard the Bible, whether with reference to revelation, to history or to morality, *it is an invaluable and inexhaustible mine of knowledge and virtue.*" Another has said, "The scholarship of the ages has gone to the Bible for light and information on all subjects." Philosophers, astronomers and scientists alike have gone to the "Book of books" for the basis of their respective lines of work. The philosopher has found in it the ground-work for the best system of philosphy; the astronomer has gleaned from it his ideas of the solar system; and the scientists have come to her mines to satiate their desire for the true principles of all science. Or as another has said: "The great body of modern scientists have made the Bible their refuge. It is the mighty ship in which they have plowed their way through the sea of science and sailed over all its tossing waves. It is the great depository of all truth. The philosophers, the giants of so-called modern science, the metaphysicians, geologists; nay, the whole concourse of scientific minds—all have fled to the Bible as a common treasury of all truth." The most powerful minds that have ever blest the world with the results of their research have, with life-long efforts, endeavored to fathom the depths and bounds of the truth of the Bible, at last to stand in utter amazement at the as yet unexplored mine of its truth. And thus having been subjected to the most scrutinizing research the Bible still remains the same inexhaustible treasury of truth, daily discovering new and fresh truths to the world—truths equally wonderful and grand as any ever before discovered. No human mind has ever yet looked to the bottom of this mine of truth. It is said that the learned Dr. Charles Elliott was a life-long Bible student, and when in his seventy-seventh year, just a month before his death, having read the O. T. through in three weeks, while intently reading his Bible one day his daughter asked him, "Father, what are you reading?" to which he promptly replied, "I'm reading the news, daughter." To him the Bible was, after a life-long research, a book of news. Professor Dana says, "The

grand old book of God still stands, and this old earth, the more its leaves are turned over and pondered, the more it will sustain and illustrate the sacred word." From the pen of Professor Hitchcock we quote the following testimony: "All along the outskirts of science infidelity has, from time to time, erected her imposing ramparts, and opened fire upon Christianity from a thousand batteries. But the moment the rays of truth were concentrated upon these ramparts, they melted away." Goethe said, "It is a belief in the Bible which has served me as the guide of my moral and literary life." The great Rousseau said, "I must confess that the majesty of the Scriptures strikes me with astonishment." Coleridge testified, "I know that the Bible is inspired because it finds me at greater depths of my being than any other book." Patrick Henry, pointing to the Bible, said: "Here is a book worth more than all other books which were ever printed." The great Doddridge is quoted as having said, "Men are indebted to the Bible for the vast store of knowledge which they have acquired. And yet, strange to say, they have never gone very far beneath the surface of this book of God for all which they know."

But how unlike this are the books of human composition. The well composed tragedies of Euripides; the densely written histories of Thucydides with every syllable pregnant with thought; the works of Lysias with their well couched and concisely written sentences; the great Phocion, with his special faculty of saying (multum in parvo) much in few words; besides Homer, Plato, and others; and the productions of the master minds of modern times, such as Butler and others have all been mastered. Every nook and corner of them has been perused by other human minds. But could we take but one telescopic view of the as yet unexplored field of divine truth in the Bible, like the disciples on the mount of transfiguration, or Paul on his way to Damascus in the presence of the post-incarnate Christ, we should fall with our faces to the earth in utter bewilderment and awful reverence. But whence came this inexhaustible—this infinite—mine of truth? If men composed it surely human minds of equal strength could fathom its truths.

But the fact that this has not been done is prima facie evidence that it has been given by inspiration of God. Truths of infinite magnitude can be given alone by the infinite mind. And so we read, "All Scripture was given by inspiration of God;" "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

But another impress of divinity in this Book of books is found,

II. IN ITS PROPHECIES.

Prophecy may be defined as "a miracle of knowledge." The prophecies of the Bible are many and very wonderful; and are of such a character as to make it impossible to account for them on any other ground than that of inspiration. A miracle is said to be a "*supernatural act.*" And so these prophecies—these miracles of knowledge—can be accounted for only as we regard them as supernatural acts. No human mind has been able to pierce the veil and look into the distant future with such certainty and accuracy as the prophets of antiquity have done. Many of their prophecies have already been fulfilled with wonderful precision, while others are now in course of fulfilment. The mention of only a few of those which have already been fulfilled will answer our purpose:

For example, the fate of Babylon was written in prophecy long before it actually became an event in history. Relative to the destruction of this ancient city we find that the prophet Isaiah (13 : 19–22) has spoken plainly: "And Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah. It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation; neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there; neither shall the shepherds make their fold there. But the wild beasts of the desert shall lie there; and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures; and owls shall dwell there, and satyrs shall dance there. And the wild beasts of the islands shall cry in their desolate houses, and dragons in their pleasant palaces; and her time is near to come, and her days shall not be prolonged." This prophecy was uttered about 712 B. C. A little later (about 595 B. C.) we have the prophecy of Jeremiah (51 : 36, 37) con-

cerning the same fate of this ancient city. "Therefore thus saith the Lord; behold I will plead thy cause, and take vengeance for thee; and I will dry up her sea, and make her springs dry. And Babylon shall become heaps, a dwelling place for dragons, an astonishment, and an hissing, without an inhabitant."

In these passages of Scripture we have stated the fact that this ancient city should become a place of utter desolation. In the book of Daniel (5 : 25–31) we have an account of the destruction of Babylon in connection with Daniel's interpretation of Belshazzar's dream. The fulfilment of the former prophecies here recorded by Daniel took place about fifty-seven years after the prophecy of Jeremiah, and about one hundred and seventy-four years after that of Isaiah. Aside from Daniel's account of the fulfilment of these prophecies, profane history bears testimony to the fact that Babylon was laid in utter ruins, and became a dwelling place for the wild beasts. Ridpath, one of the world's most authentic historians, gives us the following graphic description of Babylon's capture: * "Meanwhile, the Babylonians, in contempt of an enemy whom they supposed to be foiled in his purposes, made unusual preparations for the great feast. The young prince, Belshazzar, gave himself up recklessly to the occasion. A thousand nobles were invited to a royal banquet at the palace. There was splendor within and darkness without. It was the night of doom. While the revel was going on in the wild abandonment of victorious debauchery, the hardy Persian was opening the sluices into his canals above the city. The river began to sink, but made no moan. The invaders hurried along the banks to the wall of the city. There was no alarm. The river had left on either side a broad space of bare ground. The Persians passed in without opposition. The noise of the festival resounded afar. The river gates were seized by the invaders, who now sounded the tocsin and began the assault. It was a gigantic massacre. The drunken Babylonians fled in all directions. The prince Belshazzar and his nobles were slain at their banquet, and dawn found the victorious

*Ridpath's Hist, of the World, Vol. I., p. 296.

Persians in complete possession of the city. * * * 'The beauty of the Chaldees' excellency' faded like the shadow of a pageant from the great canvas of history, and the glory of Babylon began to hide itself under the dust and ruin of the ages."

These prophecies, with their fulfilment, are so remarkable that no one has attempted to account for them except on the ground of their inspiration. But Nineveh is another illustrious example of the same sort. Both Nahum (1 : 8; 2 : 8, 13) and Zephaniah (2 : 13, 14) prophesied concerning its destruction about 700 B. C. Profane history says that the Medes and Chaldeans took Nineveh and laid it in utter ruins 605 B. C., or 95 years after the prophecy was uttered. To this Weber (Outlines of Universal History, p. 10) adds this testimony: "A hundred and twenty years after the reign of Salmanasser, Nineveh was taken and destroyed by the Medes and Chaldeans, and the victors divided the land among themselves. * * Antiquities and works of art are still dug up from the ground where Nineveh once stood." No human mind, uninspired, has ever been able to peer into the future, with any degree of certainty and precision for a single day. Indeed the Bible (Prov. 27 : 1) has spoken plainly concerning it. "Boast not thyself of to-morrow; for thou knowest not what a day may bring forth." And yet these prophecies uttered, varying from a half to almost two centuries prior to their fulfilment, were as concise and accurate as any historian could possibly describe them after they had actually become events of history. But how shall we account for all this without inspiration? Ah! The divine mind alone can look into the future and view it as if it were in the past. For to the divine mind the past and the future are alike. For truly, "one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." (2 Pet. 3 : 8).

But let us next note some of the prophecies relative to the coming and work of Christ for further illustrations of this thought: In Genesis (3 : 15) we have the initiatory prophecy of the work of redemption by Christ, and of his final triumph over the work and power of the devil. A fearful conflict is here prophesied. The seed of the woman (Christ) shall bruise the

serpent's head; and the serpent (Satan) shall bruise his (Christ's) heel. But in the conflict "the Lion of Judah" should have a glorious victory. That our Lord has fulfilled this prophecy in his work of redemption of the world from sin and the power of Satan unto God, and in "bringing life and immortality to light" among men, needs no argument to prove. The daily experience in the common lot of men is the indubitable argument in this case. In Genesis (49 : 10) we have prophesied the time of Christ's coming: "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet, until Shiloh come." Judah did hold the scepter or royal authority till Shiloh came. But the evening of Judah's reign and the dawn of Shiloh's advent were well-nigh simultaneous events in history. But within a generation after Christ's crucifixion, according to his own prophecy, Jerusalem was destroyed, the whole civil and ecclesiastical state subverted, and all distinction among the poor harassed remnant put to confusion; and its subjects scattered abroad over the face of the earth. And to this day they have been even more destitute of the scepter and a law-giver than during their Babylonian captivity.

The evangelical prophet (Isaiah 40 : 3, 4) directed the thought of the people to the fore-runner of Christ. "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God." In the Gospel by Matthew (3 : 1–3) we have the record of the fulfillment of this prophecy. "In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, "The voice of one crying in the wilderness," etc. It does not require the eyes of a seer to recognize the fulfilment of this prophecy in the preaching and work of John the Baptist as preparatory to our Lord's advent and work in the process of the execution of the plan of redemption.

Besides these, Micah (5 : 2) foretells the place of Christ's birth more than seven hundred years before it came to pass. And Zechariah (9 : 9) his triumphal entry into Jerusalem nearly five

hundred years before the actual scene occurred; and in almost the same breath (11 : 12) his betrayal for thirty pieces of silver. And even David's prophetic eyes were not closed upon the doleful scenes of Calvary. But looking far out into the distant future he described the scene of mockery and revelry as vividly as it was possible for eye-witnesses to portray the actual scene.*

These prophecies have all been fulfilled with wonderful accuracy and precision, and their fulfilment attested to by both sacred and profane historians. They are simply such unmistakable and self-evident "miracles of knowledge" as all the world is forced to own, and as such prove beyond a question to all reasonable minds the inspiration of the Scriptures.

But let us follow these thoughts,

III. WITH A BRIEF CONSIDERATION OF THE SPLENDOR ATTENDING THE BIRTH, CRUCIFIXION AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

"A miracle may be defined as a supernatural act, that is, an act which can not be accounted for by natural causes, but requires a supernatural agency, without the sphere of nature." With this definition in mind let us view,

1. *The scene of our Saviour's Birth.* We find ourselves at once in the midst of an innumerable multitude of people. Bethlehem, the city of David, is thronged to its utmost capacity. There is no longer any room in the inns for the ingathering multitudes. No room in any inn could be found for Joseph and Mary. With many others of their company they find shelter with the beasts of burden. The shades of night gather about them. The wearied multitude, shrouded in the darkness of night, is hushed in silence. But amid the sleeping throng is cradled a new-born babe in a manger. It is Christ, the Lord of prophecy. Not far out across the hill-country of Judea the humble shepherds are watching their flock. "And lo, the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them, and they were sore afraid. And the angel said unto them, Fear not, for behold I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born

*Compare Psalm 22 : 7–18 with Matt. 27 : 39–43.

this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord. And this shall be a sign unto you; ye shall find the babe wrapped in swadling clothes lying in a manger. And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, *Glory to God in the Highest, and on earth, peace good-will toward men.* And it came to pass as the angels were gone away from them into heaven, the shepherds said one to another, let us now go even to Bethlehem and see this thing which is come to pass, which the Lord hath made known to us. And they came in haste, and found Mary and Joseph and the babe lying in a manger." Luke 2 : 9–17.

"On that night, indeed, it seemed as though the heavens must burst to disclose their radiant minstrelsies; and the stars and the feeding sheep, and the 'light amid the sound in the darkness and stillness,' and the rapture of faithful hearts, combine to furnish us with a picture painted in colors of heaven." Ah! But the scene is not yet complete. In yonder firmament there arises a star in all the brightness and splendor of heaven. The eyes of the wise men of the East are fixed upon it. They behold in its twinkling the glory of the Lord. As if directed by the finger of God they come to Jerusalem inquiring of Herod the king, "Where is he that should be born king of the Jews? For we have seen his star in the East, and are come to worship him. * * And lo, the star, which they saw in the East, went before them till it came and stood over where the young child was." Matt. 2 : 1–9.

Amid the indifference of a world unconscious of its deliverer, God led these wise men from the East to witness the miraculous glory and splendor attending the birth of our Lord and to worship him in his humble cradle. It was a most marvelous scene indeed. But from this scene of matchless splendor let us turn,

2. *To the scene of our Lord's crucifixion.*

This was a sad, but no less wonderful scene than the former. It took place only six miles from the place of the former scene. It was in the city of Jerusalem. Not unlike in the former scene the city was thronged to its utmost capacity. The multitude

had gathered for the feast of the Passover. Through the midst of this great concourse of people the wicked Jews pressed their way through the crowded streets, with one whose back was all lacerated and bleeding from the scourging he had received at their hands. They were wending their way toward a place without the city called Golgotha. On reaching the place three crosses were reared. On each cross was suspended a person. Over the head of the middle one was the superscription, "*This is Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews.*" A scene of mockery which challenges description followed. Jesus agonized and expired. But lo, even the sun would do obeisance to its Maker in this doleful hour by veiling its bright light. What consternation must have filled the hearts of this great concourse of people as they were suddenly left in midnight darkness at noonday! How the guilty conscience of Caiaphas, the high priest, must have quailed as the veil of the temple was suddenly rent in twain from the top to the bottom. What confusion must have prevailed in those crowded streets in this thick darkness for three long hours while the earth was quaking and trembling to its very centre; and the rocks are rent in pieces! Many great and good men have died and passed away, but never has the world witnessed such a display of miraculous splendor and power. No wonder the testimony came from among the by-standers, "*Truly this was the Son of God.*" And David prophesied truly (Psalm 118:23) "This is the Lord's doing: it is marvelous in our eyes."

But Jesus is laid away in Joseph's new sepulchre only to renew the scene of wonder. Sabbath morning is dawning. Hark! The earth quakes. Behold the angel of God has descended and rolled back the great stone from the door of the sepulchre. And lo, he whom they crucified and laid away has come forth. Ah! See how the keepers tremble and are become as dead men in his presence! And the very resting place of the sleeping saints has been disturbed. The graves are opened, and the sleeping saints have been awaked, and are going into the city "bringing glad tiding of great joy" to many. Ah! wonder added to wonder has only added to the confusion and consternation of

confounded people. And it might truly have been said of these wonders as of a previous occasion; "*It was never so seen in Israel.*" No, and it never has been so seen except at the hands of the God of Israel.

But what has all this to do with the inspiration of the Bible? This. He whose birth, death and resurrection were attended by these scenes of miraculous splendor and power; he, of whom it was said in the midst of this marvelous scene, "truly this was the Son of God," has declared that this book is the inspired word of God. Listen to the Lord of glory as he quotes Psalm 118 : 22; (Matt. 21 : 42) "Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the Scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes?" And then making the application to his hearers for their unbelief of the Scriptures, adds, (v. 43) "Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." But again (John 10 : 34–36): "Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the Scripture can not be broken; say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?"

And so in every stage of our Lord's public ministry, because of his persistent use of the Scriptures as the word of God, the unbelieving made confession of his divinity. Of him they said, (John 7 : 46) "Never man spake like this man." "And when the devil was cast out, the dumb spake: and the multitude marveled, saying, it was never so seen in Israel." Matt. 9 : 33. "Now when the centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus, saw the earth quake, and those things that were done, they feared greatly saying, Truly this was the Son of God." Matt. 27 : 54. Therefore, if he to whom divinity was thus ascribed quotes the Bible as the word of God, will any one presume to gainsay his testimony? Ah, no! But the testimony of the great Fawcett has found a responsive cord in the hearts of the Christian world:

"How precious is the book divine,
By inspiration given!
Bright as a lamp its doctrines shine,
To guide our souls to heaven.

It sweetly cheers our drooping hearts
In this dark vale of tears;
Life, light and joy it still imparts,
And quells our rising fears.

This lamp, through all the tedious night
Of life, shall guide our way,
Till we behold the clearer light
Of an eternal day."

But let us follow this

IV. WITH A BRIEF HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF THE BIBLE AS ANOTHER WITNESS TO ITS INSPIRATION.

History may be regarded, under ordinary circumstances, as a proper index to the thought and conviction of the popular mind. For men usually speak and act as they think and feel. Hence a few observations from history will answer our present purpose. We observe therefore,

1. That the divine authority of the Scriptures was never questioned prior to the time of the advent of Christ into the world. Wicked and ungodly persons, individually and collectively, disregarded, but never questioned the divine authority of God's word. The most antique writings of which we have any knowledge treat the Bible as an inspired book. But if men had believed that the Bible was not an inspired book they would have said so, and treated it accordingly; and history, true to its mission, would have recorded the facts in the case. But strange to say we have no such records. But we observe,

2. That profane history has never recognized any of the pretended revelations of the world as inspired books. They are simply recognizing them as factors in the false systems of religion. As such they properly enter the records of history. But if it had not been the common conviction among historians that the Bible was an inspired book, they would have placed it along side of these pretended revelations simply as factors in history. But with wonderful discrimination they have without

any exception accorded to the Bible the place which it alone deserves as "the Book of books" as God's word—branding all others as "pretended revelations." Historical facts like these can not be lightly regarded in forming our conclusions on this subject.

But we conclude our thoughts on this subject by noting briefly,

V. THE SPIRITUAL POWER OF THE BIBLE IN THE WORLD.

The influence which the Bible has wielded over the world in the past, over all nations and people of the earth wherever it is read and taught, eternity alone will reveal. Wherever the Bible has been placed in the hands of the heathen and taught to their people, their gods, as if reverently bowing to the omnipotent God, have crumbled and fallen, and their altars have been buried in the earth. By the power of divine truth their selfish habits of life have been transformed into lives of Christian discipleship; their servile worship into a service of love; their disconsolate faces into those radiant with joy in the Holy Ghost; as the sun disperses the darkness of the night, causing all nature, with renewed life and vigor, to leap for joy at the morning dawn, so divine truth disperses the darkness of heathenism and sin, and becomes the power of God unto salvation unto every one that believeth. Or to use the figure of the Evangelical Prophet (Isa. 55 : 10, 11): "For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater; so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it." This prophecy in its course of fulfilment is witnessing the transformation of the kingdoms of this world into the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ. And in bringing about this blissful change the Bible stands alone as the one book inspired of God to this end. It is the one Book of books which leads in the civilization and evangelization of the world. What has the Tripitaka of the Buddhists done in either

of these respects for the world? How much has the Koran of Mohammed contributed toward civilization or evangelization? What have either of these pretended revelations done for the amelioration of mankind? But the Bible is "exerting its benign influences over the civilized and the barbarous, the learned and the ignorant, the rich and the poor, the high and the low, blessing the king upon his throne and the peasant in his cottage; purifying the centers of civilization, and pursuing men with its conservative and elevating power to the utmost verge of human society."

Again, the Bible stands alone in its hold upon the human heart. When the finger of God wrote upon the wall of King Belshazzar's palace these words, "Mene, Mene, Tekel Upharsin," "the kings countenance was changed, and his thoughts troubled him so that the joints of his loins were loosed, and his knees smote one against another." (Dan. 5 : 6).

It is said of Voltaire that he was daring enough at one time to attempt to versify that affecting penitential Psalm, the fifty-first. Everything went well enough until he came to the tenth verse, the prayer, "Create in me a clean heart, O God!" But his pride and infernal hatred against God and his worshipers did not permit him, with the royal penitent, to entreat of God "a clean heart." However he tried to versify it. But suddenly the terror of hell seized him; the pen refused to move beneath the hand of the reprobate who had indited so many blasphemies and obscenities for the destruction of innocence and the fear of God. He sought to flee, but he could not. He fell half senseless on his couch, and was afterwards compelled to confess that he could not think of the appalling occurrence without renewing the terror in his soul.

It was this same word of God which our Lord was preaching when the officers came to apprehend him, but returned saying, "Never man spake like this man." An infidel once said, "There is one thing that mars all the pleasure of my life." "Indeed!" replied his friend: "and what is that?" He answered seriously, "I am afraid the Bible is true. If I could know for certain that death is an eternal sleep, I should be happy; my joy would be

complete! But there is the thorn that stings me. This is the sword that pierces my soul, *if the Bible is true I am lost forever.*"

It was the same Bible from which Paul "reasoned of righteousness, temperance and judgment to come" when Felix trembled. It was the power of this truth which caused devils "to believe and tremble" under the preaching of Christ. It is characteristic of the Bible to take hold of the human heart as no other book ever has done. And in this is grounded its self-perpetuating power. In the providence of God the world has never been able to hide or extinguish it. On the other hand, infidels have written books, but where are they? Where is Porphyry, or Julian? Fragments there are; but we are indebted even for these to Christian criticism. Where is Hume, Voltaire, Bolingbroke? It requires the world's reprieve to bring a copy out of their darkness. *But where is the Bible?* Wherever there is light, speaking the language of heaven in over three hundred of the tongues of earth, and giving the word of God by fifty million voices to five times as many millions of men; and having swept its path of storm through all time, it still walks triumphant, despite earth's malice and hell's eternal wrath; and like the apocalyptic angel, though it wraps its mantle of cloud around it, calmly looks out upon the world with a face as it were the sun encircled with a rainbow. And when all the parchments of earth with "the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up," the Bible will still remain the same glorious book of God. For, "heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." Matt. 24 : 35.

> "Firm as a rock thy truth must stand,
> When rolling years shall cease to move."

ARTICLE VI.

THE LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

By Rev. Thomas A. Himes, A. M.

The doctrine of the Lord's Supper is one of the most intricate and difficult of all the doctrines of the divine word. It has been the occasion of bitter controversies, and of unhappy divisions in the Church, because of its difficulties, and because earnest sincere men have thought that the Lord's Supper embodies truth which is vital to the Christian system. The controversies on this subject do not date back to the early period of the Church. The energies of the early Church were employed in the development of the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Person of Christ, and no attention was given to a statement in form of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. The early Church fathers do not seem to have had very exact views on this subject. It would certainly be wrong to attempt to discover in their writings the distinctions which have divided the Church in later times. But the tendency in the early Church was unquestionably toward the mystical rather than toward the rationalistic view of the Lord's Supper. The first deliverance on this doctrine by the Church in an authoritative way was by the Council of Nice in the year 787, which was, "that the elements after consecration were no longer figures or antitypes of the body and blood of Christ but really the body and blood." In the ninth century Radbertus taught, "that after the consecration of the bread and wine nothing but their form remains, their substance being wholly changed, so that they are no longer bread and wine but the body and blood of Christ. Their form continues that no one may take offence at seeing Christian's eat human flesh and blood." We see already in this the Romish doctrine beginning to take form. In the year 1215 the Lateran Council stated the doctrine as follows: "The true body and blood of Christ are truly contained in the sacrament of the altar, under the form of bread and wine, the bread

having been transubstantiated into the body and the wine into the blood, by divine power." The Council of Trent in the year 1551 decreed the following: "This holy synod doth now declare it anew, that by the consecration of the bread and wine, a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ, our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood, which conversion is by the holy Catholic Church suitably and properly called transubstantiation." This result was not reached without opposition. But the independent thinkers on this subject, as on all others, were from time to time put to silence by the strong hand of the papacy. The Reformation of the sixteenth century afforded the first opportunity for the untrammeled discussion of this doctrine. And the extreme teaching of the papal Church forced the question upon the reformers early in their work. But while all the reformers agreed in rejecting the Romish doctrine they were not agreed among themselves in other particulars. Even within the different branches of the Reformation Church great diversity appeared. A distinctively Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper has however been developed, and has been accepted by the great body of those who bear the name of the great reformer. To the discussion of the subject, The Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper, we devote this paper.

We desire to discuss the subject under three main divisions.

I. The Lutheran doctrine as to the manner in which the sacrament of the Lord's Supper proves efficacious, whether as mere *opus operatum*, or as conditioned by faith in the one receiving it.

II. The Lutheran doctrine as to the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper. And,

III. The importance of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

I. The Lutheran doctrine as to the manner in which the sacrament of the Lord's Supper proves efficacious.

The teaching of our Church on this point is contained in the Augsburg Confession, Article XIII, which is as follows:

"Concerning the use of the sacraments our Churches teach, that they were instituted not only as marks of Christian profes-

sion amongst men; but rather as signs and evidences of the will of God towards us, for the purpose of exciting and confirming the faith of those who use them. Hence the sacraments ought to be received with faith in the promises which are exhibited and set forth by them.

"They therefore condemn those who teach that the sacraments justify *ex opere operato*, by the mere performance of the act, and who do not teach that faith, which believes our sins to be forgiven, is required in the use of the sacraments."

The manner of the efficacy of the sacrament must be kept distinct from any view we may hold concerning the presence of Christ in the sacrament. It must not be thought that because the Lutheran Church takes high ground in the matter of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament of the altar, that she therefore believes that the sacrament has saving power, or some magic influence for good, independent of the subjective condition of the recipient. The Lutheran Church does not teach, and never has taught anything of the kind. The Lutheran Church holds that there is inherent power in the sacrament, but that this power does not save, only as we lay hold by living, earnest faith upon the Christ of the sacrament. It is sometimes charged upon the Lutheran Church that her teaching is, that all any one has to do is to be baptized and confirmed and receive the Lord's Supper at not too long intervals, and salvation is sure. This is a mistake based upon the grossest ignorance. Even the Roman Catholic Church does not teach anything so extreme. The Roman Catholic Church holds that the sacrament effects the salvation only of those who do not resist. She holds that the sacrament works *ex opere operato*, but that its power can be resisted, and therefore in particular cases may fail. A church that holds the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ alone, as the Lutheran Church does, can never believe that the sacrament saves by the mere performance. This the Lutheran Church has never done.

II. The Lutheran doctrine as to the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper.

The teaching of our Church on this point is contained in the Augsburg Confession, Article X, which reads:

"In regard to the Lord's Supper our Churches teach that the body and blood of Christ are truly present and are dispensed to the communicants in the Lord's Supper: and they disapprove those who teach otherwise."

This is a very brief statement of so important a doctrine, but it contains the whole doctrine as taught by the Lutheran Church. It is in a very undeveloped form; but it could not be expected that extensive definitions and distinctions would be given in a document intended to serve the purpose of the Augsburg Confession. This article teaches the doctrine of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper.

1. But before we attempt a discussion and defense of our Lutheran doctrine on this point it may be well to distinguish the Lutheran from the other doctrines.

(1.) It is distinguished from the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. The Roman Catholic Church teaches, as we have seen in our brief historical sketch, that the bread and wine of the sacrament are transubstantiated, that is, changed, by the consecration of the priest, into the body and blood of Christ, and are no longer bread and wine. Our Lutheran doctrine is that there is no change whatever in the substance of the elements of bread and wine. The bread remains bread and the wine remains wine. Paul speaks of the bread and wine after their consecration as bread and wine. This shows that he has no thought that any transubstantiation has taken place. According to our Lutheran view, there is a union of the word of God with the visible elements, and this union constitutes the sacrament, and because of this union the visible elements, yet remaining bread and wine, are a means of conveying to us the body and blood of Christ. There is no miracle in the sacrament except the miracle which runs through the whole plan and work of redemption.

(2.) The Lutheran doctrine is also distinguished from consubstantiation. This doctrine has been charged upon the Lutherans by their opponents. Consubstantiation, according to Web-

ster, means "identity or union of substance." As applied in connection with the Lord's Supper, it means the coalescing of the body of Christ with the bread, and of the blood of Christ with the wine, in each case, into one substance. To have consubstantiation one of three things must take place. Either the bread and wine must become the body and blood of Christ, which would be the Romish error under a new name, and which our Church rejects, or the body and blood of Christ must become bread and wine, which nobody maintains, or a new substance is formed which is neither bread and wine nor the body and blood of Christ, which also no one has ever entertained or could entertain for a minute. Plainly the word consubstantiation does not express the Lutheran view. The words *in*, *with* and *under*, used by the Lutherans to set forth the connection of the body and blood of Christ with the bread and wine, do not mean "identity or union of substance," and therefore give no warrant for the charge against our Church of holding to consubstantiation. Our theologians from Luther down have emphatically rejected the name and all it implies. And the persistent reiteration of the charge of consubstantiation against the Lutheran Church by her enemies is evidence of a lack either of fairness or of critical discrimination.

(3.) And, further, the Lutheran doctrine is distinguished from that of Zwingli, namely, that there is no presence whatever of Christ in the Lord's Supper, but the bread and wine in a figurative way merely represent the body and blood of Christ, and are to be received in remembrance of him, our absent Lord. Zwingli emphasizes the clause, "This do in remembrance of me." He makes this the main feature of the institution. He argues that because we are called upon to remember Christ in the Lord's Supper he is therefore not present. He thinks it folly that we should be called upon to remember a present Saviour. But Christ has plainly promised to be present and evidently is present with us. He says: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee." But notwithstanding, we do forget Christ we fail to be-believe at all times in his presence and help. We fail to trust him

implicitly. We cannot see Christ with our natural eyes, and we are prone to forget him. Christ could therefore properly say: "This do in remembrance of me" the ever present Saviour. Call to mind my continual presence and help. But the remembrance of Christ is not the main feature of the Lord's Supper. This we know because this clause is not found in the accounts of Matthew and Mark, which were written earlier than the accounts of Luke and Paul. If the Lord's Supper was intended to be in remembrance of Christ merely, there must have been a very grave misunderstanding of it by the first two evangelists. This is not at all admissible.

This view, which is here set forth, and which is known as Zwinglianism, is the very lowest view which has been held of the Lord's Supper. It is the prevailing view of the denominations to-day that are Armenian in doctrine. But it is worthy of note that Zwingli himself, before the close of his life, seems to have abandoned it and to have taken higher ground.

(4.) The Lutheran doctrine is distinguished also from that of the Calvinists. The doctrine of the Calvinists is, that the glorified human nature of Christ remains in heaven, and therefore, cannot be present in the Lord's Supper, but that Christ is present as to his divine nature, and that the heart of the *believing* communicant "through the agency of the Holy Spirit, is elevated to Christ in heaven, who feeds and nourishes him, with the life-giving power of his flesh and blood." "According to the Calvinist the presence of Christ is a presence only in the devotion, and in the inwardness of the believing heart." It is faith energizing, reaching heavenward, that secures this presence of Christ for its own inward contemplation and satisfaction.

This view rests upon a violent separation of the natures of Christ, which destroys him entirely. The divine and the human natures enter in together, as constituting the person of Christ. Take either away and you have no Christ. Christ can not be present at all, only as he is present in his divine-human personality. Presence implies presence of the person, not of his efficacy and power merely. Christ is a divine-human person. A presence of the divine nature, which excludes the hu-

man element from the Christ person, is no presence of Christ at all. The Calvinists object to the Lutheran idea of the ubiquity of the human nature of Christ. This is the chief ground of their objection to the Lutheran doctrine of the presence of Christ in the Supper. If the human nature of Christ is not ubiquitous, then his divine nature is not ubiquitous, else there are two Christs, a divine and a human, which is an absurdity. But the Lutheran theologians do not hold that the human nature of Christ is ubiquitous in the same way as his divine nature. The divine nature is ubiquitous "of itself in virtue of its own essence." The human nature is ubiquitous through the divine nature and by virtue of its union with the divine in the person of Christ. We can not conceive how that Christ can be ubiquitous as to his human nature, we admit, but neither can we conceive how he can be ubiquitous as to his divine nature. But we must not limit Christ's power by our weak human conceptions. The objection aims at the power of Christ, and is made from the standpoint of human comprehension, and therefore cannot hold. Then, too, the Calvinistic idea of the agency of the Holy Spirit and of the part faith performs in the communion of the Lord's Supper, presents graver difficulties, and is open to more serious objection than it is possible to urge against the Lutheran doctrine. The Holy Spirit is present, it is true, in the Lord's Supper, as he is always present with the word of God as an enlightening and sanctifying agency, but it is no where taught in the Scripture that he mediates the presence of Christ. Christ is able to be present in his own power, and by his own agency. Faith is necessary to worthy communion with the body and blood of Christ, it is true, but the part of faith is not to reach up into heaven to commune with Christ there. It is sufficient that faith should perform the humbler part of gladly receiving Christ, when he gives himself to us in this world, in his complete divine-human personality, as the Scriptures plainly assure us that he does.

But the Calvinistic view of the Lord's Supper perhaps approaches the Lutheran more nearly than any other, and has exerted a wide influence. Even Melanchthon, in his later years,

was suspected of leaning toward the Calvinistic side of the controversy. But the leading Lutheran theologians combated their opponents with stubborn persistence, and the Lutheran doctrine has continued to hold its ground against all opposition..

2. We now come to the consideration of the scriptural grounds for our doctrine of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper. Our Lutheran doctrine on this point is based on a literal interpretation of the words of institution, which, taken from Matthew, are as follows: "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat, this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Jesus says, "This is my body," "this is my blood." At the Marburg Conference Luther planted himself squarely upon the literal meaning of this Scripture, and no argument could shake him from his position. He did not profess to understand and explain the Saviour's words, but simply believed just what they declared. He says: * "Christ has said, 'This is my body,' let them show me that a body is not a body. I reject reason, common sense, carnal arguments, and mathematical proofs. God is above mathematics. We have the word of God, we must adore it, and perform it." By this he means that no argument from reason can hold against the plain teaching of the word of God. This is a sound principle. Luther's opponents would doubtless have conceded that this principle must be followed in dealing with the doctrines, for instance, of the Trinity and of the Person of Christ. These doctrines transcend human logic and comprehension, and rest wholly upon the word of God. But these men would not allow the principle to hold in interpreting the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper. One of the principles of Hermeneutics is that the natural and literal meaning of a passage of Scripture must always be taken, unless something in the passage itself, or in the context, clearly indicates that a figurative meaning is intended, or unless such interpreta-

*D'Aubigne's Hist. of Ref., American Tract Soc. edition, Vol. IV, p. 80.

tion conflicts with other plain Scripture. There is a figure in the words, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood," in Luke's and Paul's accounts of the institution of the Lord's Supper, where cup is put for the contents of the cup. But this is plain to all. The words require a figurative interpretation. But it is not so in the case of the terms "body" and "blood." Nothing in the passage, or in the word of God anywhere implies that they are meant as figures. The opponents of Luther cited the Saviour's interpretation of the passage in the sixth chapter of John's gospel, where he speaks of giving us his flesh and blood to eat. The Saviour, as in explanation, says: "It is the spirit that maketh alive; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken unto you, they are spirit and they are life." Luther replied that the passage did not refer to the Lord's Supper. This is true. The passage in the sixth chapter of John is not the institution of the Lord's Supper. But the underlying principle is doubtless the same. And I am of the opinion that the Saviour's interpretation of that passage holds also with reference to the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper, in the sense, however, in which he applied it. He interprets the eating of his flesh and the drinking of his blood spiritually as against a carnal interpretation, but not as against a literal interpretation. The terms spiritual and carnal are in opposition. And the terms literal and figurative are in opposition. But the terms spiritual and literal are not in opposition. Words may be meant in a spiritual sense and be also literal. When the Saviour says these words are to be understood in a spiritual sense, he has in mind the gross carnal view of the people of Capernaum concerning the eating of his flesh and the drinking of his blood, and his interpretation does not give warrant for the idea of a figurative and wholly unreal giving of himself to us. In the Saviour's interpretation of his words he does not recede from his former statements, he does not say to them that he had been indulging in figures which meant very little, he brushes away their carnal ideas, but he tells them that these words, which were hard to receive, had yet in them true life-giving power. "The words that I speak unto you," he says, "they are spirit and they are life."

Christ means in this sixth chapter of John, as in the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper, that he really and truly gives himself to us as the food of the new man which is to arise within us. There is a real and true giving, and a real and true receiving, or eating if you please. The truth lies in the domain of the spiritual and not of the carnal. We have strictly no words for spiritual ideas. In seeking to convey a spiritual truth, of necessity we must adapt words from those we use in conveying natural truth. The Saviour says, "I am the door." He does not mean that he is a rectangular opening in a wall, but that he is the means of entrance into his kingdom. Hence Webster gives as a third definition of the word door, "a means of approach or access." And as the word is commonly used in this sense, this definition conveys a literal truth. So also Christ says, "I am the way, the truth, and the life." Is this figurative language? Not at all. The most ostensible meaning of the word, "way," is "that by which one passes or progresses." This is Webster's second definition, and he cites as an illustration of it, "way to heaven." Is not Christ literally the way to heaven? And is not Christ also "the truth?" He is in his person the embodiment of his gospel. The truth which centres in the person of Christ constitutes the gospel. He is literally "the truth." He is also "the life." He makes us alive, and lives in us. This is shown in the Scripture of the vine and the branches. There is an influx of life and nourishment from the vine unto the branches, else they shrivel up and die. The real substance of the vine flows into and sustains the branches. Not less really does Christ come into us, and sustain us in a living relation with himself. Thus we might multiply examples to show that words may have a secondary or derived meaning which is not figurative, but expresses as literal a truth as when the words are used in their primary signification. Many words indeed have lost their primary meaning, and the first thought they suggest is the secondary or derived meaning. So when the Saviour says: "This is my body," "this is my blood," he does not mean his carnal flesh and blood, but he means his true substance and life, which he gives for the life, and sustenance

of the new man begotten in us. These he truly gives us. Our physical being could not be satisfied with pictures and illustrations of a feast. Our physical natures crave and demand more than fine paintings of fruits and delicious fare. These might be so skillfully made as to deceive the eye, but they could not deceive our hungry bodies. They would only mock the appetite of the hungry man. Our bodies demand the real and true substance of nourishment. So with our inner life. Christ is the food of the new man, and there must be a real and true receiving and assimilation of him into our life. There is no figure about this. It must be literal and real. If this is not true, we are being deceived and cheated by the plain teaching of the word of God. It does not require, therefore, a peculiar faith to see a literal meaning in the words of Christ, "This is my body," "this is my blood," "given for you."

Then, further, it seems unquestionable that the apostles understood the words of institution of the Lord's Supper literally. The evangelists use substantially the same words in recording the institution of the Supper. Paul also uses the same words, and declares that he received the institution direct from the Lord. The words, "This is my body," occur in all the four accounts. Concerning the blood there is a slight but immaterial variation. This uniformity shows that they attached great importance to the words of the institution, and understood them in their literal sense. Why do these inspired men insist so much upon these very words, when they could have foreseen that this would lead persons coming after them to understand the words literally, if they did not intend it in that way? Paul claims and doubtless had immediate revelation from Christ on this subject. And why does he not give at least a hint that these words should be understood as figures merely? On the contrary he attaches to them their literal meaning. He says: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ, the bread which we break is it not the communion of the body of Christ? The word here translated communion also means a participation or partaking. The body

and blood of Christ are therefore communicated and partaken in the Lord's Supper. Then again Paul says: "He that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself if he discern not the body." How could he say this, if he had not understood that the body of Christ is in the sacrament, that is, understood the words of the institution literally? We believe, therefore, that Article X. of the Augsburg Confession is founded upon, and is a correct interpretation of the word of God.

3. But it may be expected that we define more positively this real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper. It is good Lutheranism to believe this doctrine on the authority of the word of God without any attempt at definition or explanation. The more faith we have in the word of God, and the less we try to reason the matter out and make it plain to the logical understanding the better Lutherans we are. The Lutheran theologians profess not to offer any definition as to the manner of the presence, and hold only to the fact, the manner being incomprehensible and mysterious. Mosheim says:* What the nature of this presence is we know not. The thing itself we know, but the mode of its truth is a mystery which we cannot comprehend. We deny that Christ is received in a physical or natural manner. But should any one ask: How is he present? Our answer is, We know not. We commonly call his presence in this holy ordinance a sacramental presence. This might seem to be an attempt to define the mode of his presence but by this word we mean nothing more than that we are ignorant of the mode. It has been said that we receive Jesus in, under, or with the bread. These three words might signify three modes, but they are designed to indicate that we do not wish to determine anything about the mode of Christ's presence." Gerhard says:† "This presence is called *sacramental*, because the celestial object in this mystery is bestowed and presented to us through the medium of external sacramental symbols: it is called *true* and *real* to exclude the figment of a figurative, im-

*Quoted in Schmucker's Popular Theology, fourth edition, page 249.

†Quoted in Schmid's Dogmatic, second English edition, by Hay and Jacobs, p. 564.

aginary, and representative presence; *substantial*, to exclude the subterfuge of our opponents concerning the merely efficacious presence of the body and blood of Christ in this mystery; *mystical*, *supernatural*, and *incomprehensible*, because in this mystery the body and blood of Christ are present not in a worldly manner, but in a mystical, supernatural, and incomprehensible manner. Some of our theologians have called it a *corporeal* presence, but only with respect to the object, and not at all to the mode. They wish to say by this that not only the virtue and efficacy, but the substance itself of the body and blood of Christ, is present in the holy Supper; for they oppose this word to spiritual presence as it is defined by their opponents, but by no means wish to say thereby that the body of Christ is present in a corporeal and quantitative manner." Luther says:* "We poor sinners are not so foolish as to believe that Christ's body is in the bread in the gross and visible manner, like bread in a basket, or wine in a goblet, as some charge us with believing, for the purpose of amusing themselves at our simplicity. But we hold the straightforward belief that his body is there, as the words plainly indicate. * * We will not quarrel about words, but the meaning remains the same, and that is, that it is not mere bread that we partake of in the sacrament but the body of Christ."

These quotations ought to make it plain to every one that, to whatever extremes in language our theologians sometimes may seem to have gone, they have invariably rejected the view of the carnal presence of Christ in the Supper. The Lutheran view of the sacrament of the altar does not inculcate that error. The only body of Christ in existence is his glorified body. This body is the same in identity as that which hung on the cross, although the material elements have been dropped. Paul speaks of our resurrection body, which is to be like Christ's glorified body, as a spiritual body. The words, "spiritual body," are a contradiction, if by body is meant any earthly substance. Christ's glorified body must therefore be of spiritual substance, of which we know absolutely nothing. We

*Quoted in Luth. Doc. of the Lord's Supper, by Dr. Morris, p. 10.

know something about spiritual qualities. Christ's beauteous character of righteousness and purity is spiritual; his great power, his incomparable love, and his personality are spiritual. About these we know something; but as to the substance in which they inhere we know nothing. That Christ can and does give us of his substance we may believe on the authority of his own words. But this is a matter of faith. The understanding must bow before this inscrutable mystery. Shall faith stagger because the understanding cannot enter here?

4. It is readily perceived that the Lutheran doctrine embodies the idea that there is objective content in the sacrament, that there is in the sacrament a heavenly gift, and that God offers this gift in the sacrament to men. In connection with this there are two points which have been the subjects of controversy between our theologians and their opponents.

(1.) As to the manner of receiving the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament, our theologians have held, that since there is a union of the heavenly gift with the visible sign, of the supernatural element with the natural, in the Lord's Supper, this heavenly gift, this supernatural element, is received with the visible sign by the communicant with the mouth. It might be said that this is a matter of logical inference rather than of direct scriptural teaching. As Dr. Krauth observes,* the term, "with the mouth," as defining the manner of receiving the body and body and blood of Christ in the sacrament is not found in any of the Lutheran symbols, except the Formula of Concord, which appeared thirty-four years after Luther's death, and therefore, cannot be regarded as essential to Lutheran confessional statement. But the term was in general use before that time by the Lutherans, and the idea does seem to be involved in the doctrine of the objective sacrament. Luther says: † "Christ has not rejected all oral manducation but only a material manducation." But by this idea of the sacramental reception of the body and blood of Christ with the mouth is only meant that there is an actual receiving of the whole content of the sacrament. It is not

*Conserv. Ref., p. 461.

†D'Aubigne's Hist. of Ref., American Tract Soc. edition, Vol. IV, p. 81.

meant that there is any physical eating of the body and blood of Christ. The Formula of Concord, after opposing the word "spiritually" to the Capernaitic idea, says:* "In this sense we also say that in the Holy Supper the body and blood of Christ are spiritually received, eaten, and drunken; although this participation occurs with the mouth, yet the mode is spiritual." In the sacrament of the altar the word of God is made visible and tangible. It ought not to be any more difficult to see how that a spiritual participation of the sacrament is effected with the mouth, than to see how there may be a spiritual participation of the spoken word of God through the organ of hearing. All participation in Christ must be through some bodily sense. And why may it not be effected through touch and taste as well as through any other sense. We believe the Lord's Supper was instituted because Christ could give himself to us more effectively in this way than in abstract spiritual form. As if Christ were to say: "Handle me and see," taste me and see, "and be not faithless but believing." Our Lutheran theologians have never understood by this sacramental eating with the mouth, that there is a physical eating and assimilating into our bodies of the substance of the body and blood of Christ, but only such physical contact with the sacrament as is necessary to awaken spiritual apprehension and reception of the heavenly gift.

(2.) But another point of controversy in this connection is as to what the unbelieving communicant receives. Our Lutheran doctrine is that the unbeliever, if he presume to come to the holy communion, receives the same as the believer, that is, both receive the body and blood of Christ, since they are in the sacrament, but the believer receives them unto salvation, and the unbeliever unto condemnation. If there be objective content in the sacrament, as our Church holds, true it is, that the unbelieving communicant is brought into actual contact with it. Martensen says: † "Unbelievers also who partake of the sacrament come into actual relation with the All-holy: and although we cannot say of them that they eat the sacrament, that is,

*Dr. H. E. Jacob's Translation, p. 620.

†Christian Dogmatics, Edinburgh Edition, p. 439.

make it their food, yet we must say that they receive it." The Calvinists teach that the unbeliever receives bread and wine and nothing more, and that only those who partake in faith receive the true sacrament. The sacrament is constituted by the word of God and not by the faith of the communicant. To say that the unbeliever receives only bread and wine is to say that unbelief can unmake a divine institution. It cannot be true. What God has ordained and appointed by his word no man can overturn. God by his word has ordained and appointed the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. It remains a sacrament in spite of unbelief. The Saviour did not say: This is my body, if ye believe; or this is my blood, if ye believe. But he said: This is my body, this is my blood. The unbeliever, therefore, who dares approach the table of the Lord, receives just what the Saviour's words appoint that the sacrament shall contain. It must be to his condemnation. "He that eateth and drinketh eateth and drinketh judgment to himself if he discern not the body."

III. The importance of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

There are those who contend that little significance attaches to the different views of the Lord's Supper, but that the whole matter should be relegated to the domain of the speculative, as having nothing to do with practical Christian life. Nothing could be further from the truth. Both as to its *method* and as to its *content*, our Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper has important concerns for the practical in our Christian faith and life.

1. As to method it concerns the authority of the word of God, and, therefore, the very groundwork of our Christian faith. This is manifest when we consider the principle of scriptural interpretation upon which our doctrine of the Lord's Supper stands. Luther's contention for a literal interpretation of the words of the institution proceeds from his profound reverence for the word of God, and respect for its authority. The want of this is most disastrous. It cannot be denied that to Luther's "Thus saith the Lord" his enemies opposed their own human reason-

ing. The opposition to Luther's doctrine was from a rationalistic standpoint. Not all the enemies of the Lutheran doctrine are rationalists, but their method is rationalistic. With the Reformation of the sixteenth century there was a breaking away from old doctrines and forms. The destructive instincts of men were awake. Men's minds for so long time had been bound by a superstitious faith in the trusts of a tyrannical papacy, that when the liberation came there was great danger of a rebound from superstitious credulity to a rationalistic rejection of things vital to Christian faith and life. This rebound actually came. The opposition to the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper was from this tendency. D'Aubigne, who was a Calvinist, says,* that if Luther had yielded at Marburg, where the one point of difference between him and Zwingli, was the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, "it might have been feared that the Reformation would have fallen into the extreme of rationalism." He acknowledges Zwingli's rationalistic tendency. True he ascribes to Luther a tendency toward popery, but the friends of Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper do not believe that it was inspired by a lingering love which Luther had for popery, which the Calvinists have charged upon him, but by his loyalty to the word of God, and by a fear which he had of departing from its plain teaching. He apprehended danger in such a departure. Luther saw in the Lord's Supper the embodiment of the deep things of God, the profound mystery of the atonement and of the new life. Dr. Krauth truthfully says:* "There is no process by which the doctrine of the Lutheran Church, in regard to the Lord's Supper, can be overthrown, which does not overthrow the entire fabric of the atonement." It is a significant fact that since the above has been in print there has been made a determined attack upon the doctrine of the atonement, by the same processes, and from the camp of the same enemy, that came to the assault against Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, notably by the Andover school of theology. And, further, it is noteworthy, that from the same source, and by the same

*Hist. of Ref., Am. Tract Soc. Edit., Vol. IV, p. 97.
*Conserv. Ref., p. 585.

methods, has proceeded the attack of the higher criticism against the absolute authority of the sacred Scriptures themselves. If the methods of scriptural interpretation, employed from the time of Luther, against the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, are conceded to be sound, there is nothing to prevent those using these methods, from overturning the very groundwork of our Christian faith. In the times of the Reformation Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper stood as a bulwark of the Church against the rationalistic tendency. When rationalism sought to enter the Lutheran temple, Luther met it at the threshold with his doctrine of the Lord's Supper and barred the entrance. If it had not been for Luther's unswerving loyalty to the divine word, and his unquestioning faith in its plain teaching, and his doctrine of the holy Supper which was a sequence of these, rationalism would have swept away the positive and the real from the doctrine and worship of the Church, and left only the bleakness and desolation of mere negations. In comparison with this even Roman Catholicism might be preferred. The rationalism which afterward sprung up in the Lutheran Church was not fostered by the Lutheran principle. On the other hand Calvinism as a system, with its subjectivism, is rationalistic. Rationalism in the Lutheran Church begins by being un-Lutheran. Rationalism in the Calvinistic churches, while in its conclusions it may make wide departures from the Calvinistic standards, yet in its spirit and in its method, finds such congeniality with the Calvinistic temper, that it can be only with great difficulty, if at all, dislodged. The present experience of the Presbyterian Church with the higher criticism is in proof of this. On the other hand, Lutheranism has not in it the virus of rationalism, and has come forth from its battles with this destroyer, with its system and its cardinal doctrines intact. Lutheranism, with the place it gives to the divine word, with its doctrine of faith, and of the Person of Christ, and of the atonement, and of the Lord's Supper, possesses true unity and must be abiding.

2. But the importance of our doctrine of the Supper is also manifest when we consider the content, when we consider what it offers to the communicant at the holy table. We dare not

offer less than the Saviour offered to the disciples in the institution of the Supper, without loss of a most practical character, loss of true consolation, and of sanctifying power to the believer. According to our Lutheran faith there is effected in the sacramental communion a participation in the full benefit of the atonement, consequently the believer has, in this holy ordinance, a joyous assurance of forgiveness and reconciliation and the sweet peace of an unburdened conscience, all of which tends to the best results in spiritual growth and holy living. Luther, in his Small Catechism, says, that the benefits which we derive from eating and drinking in the Lord's Supper are pointed out in the words of the institution, "Given and shed for you for the remission of sins," and adds: "Which words show us that forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation are granted to us in the sacrament; for where there is forgiveness of sins there is also life and salvation." We dare not think less concerning this holy communion without denying the words of Christ. If this ordinance of the word of God is robbed of its power, is it not to the despoiling of the very word itself, with great loss to personal faith and life? According to the Roman Catholic the Lord's Supper is a mere performance, requiring no faith or personal concern in the communicant, but with a supernatural effect. According to the Zwinglian it is also a mere performance, but with a natural effect. Romanism holds to the extreme miraculous or magical power of the sacrament. Zwinglianism holds to the extreme naturalistic view of its efficacy. Lutheranism is the true medium. While taking away its magical efficacy Lutheranism conceives of the sacrament as a true communion with the divine, and as a true means of grace. Calvinism seeks to put the new wine of a spiritual presence into the old bottle of the Zwinglian figurative interpretation. It adds to the Zwinglian view the new ideas of the presence of the divine nature of Christ, mediated by the Holy Spirit, and of a sublimated faith reaching into heaven for the benefits which Christ has put in the sacrament. But these ideas are extra-scriptural, and were doubtless advanced to relieve Zwinglianism of its spiritual barrenness.

The Zwinglian's supper is a mock supper. And the Calvinistic view, in making the whole power to rest in the faith of the communicant, destroys the true consolation and satisfaction which the institution offers, because we might always remain in doubt as to whether our faith had been sufficient. Martensen says: * "It is the consolation of the objective sacrament that the blessing is given to him who is weak in faith, and who has need of strengthening; herein is just the comfort, that the Lord descends to us, comes to the help of our weakness; whereas the subjective doctrine of the sacrament makes all to depend upon the perfection of our faith, and upon the frame of mind in which we are at the moment we partake of it, and it must lead to an anxious effort, a straining of every nerve by means of which the man endeavors to soar upward to heaven." The subjective doctrine of the sacrament leads to an effort to work out our own salvation without the inspiring thought that it is God who worketh in us. It is therefore barren of true consolation. The Lutheran doctrine also secures deep personal concern in the communicant, but with a different result. It teaches that the gift of God is in the sacrament, and needs only to be partaken of since it is offered, and, therefore, inspires to the full assurance of faith. According to the Lutheran idea, the celebration of the Holy Supper is the highest act of worship. It is looked forward to with concern lest it should be profaned by personal unfitness. It is celebrated with the profoundest reverence and devotion. The solicitude of the Lutheran communicant as to personal worthiness falsifies the charge,† made against our Church, that our view promotes the superstition of the *ex opere operato* power of the sacrament. The Lutheran believes, that in order to participate in the benefit of the sacrament, deep contrition and earnest living personal faith are required. He also believes that, because of what the sacrament contains, great guilt befalls those who trifle with it. Hence he does not come with indifference. Romanism and Zwinglianism alike promote indifference in the communicant. The Romanist can say: What need of

*Christian Dogmatics, Edinburg edition, p. 439.
†Shedd's Hist. of Christian Doct., Vol. 2, p. 451.

concern, since the sacrament can effect my salvation without my concern? And the Zwinglian can say: What need of concern, since there is nothing supernatural in the sacrament? The Lutheran has concern because his doctrine apprehends both the heavenly gift and the fact that it does not avail unto his salvation, unless he approach the holy table with a godly sorrow on account of sin, with earnest faith which lays hold upon and appropriates Christ's atonement, and with a sincere purpose to follow his Lord and Master.

We believe, therefore, that our Lutheran doctrine of the Holy Supper is the scriptural doctrine, that it must follow from an unqualified submission to the word of God, and that it contributes most to devotion, to living faith, and to the highest Christian life. Its great beauty and power consist in this, that it leaves the mystery of the Supper untouched, it does not depart from the words of the institution. There are many who say of our doctrine of the Supper, just as some said of Christ's mystical words: "This is a hard saying, who can hear it?" Many stumble at this doctrine. The Lutheran Church has lost following because of this doctrine of the Supper, just as Christ lost following because of his hard sayings. But it will be found that the true worshiper will not be satisfied with less. There is a deep hungering in our human hearts for the mystical and the supernatural. God has implanted in us a faith to lay hold on these. That which is presented to our understanding merely, that which can be comprehended, since it leaves nothing for faith, can not satisfy the religious nature of man. The enemies of the mystical doctrine of the Supper in seeking to reduce the matter to logical formula, have robbed the scriptural Supper of its beauty, and of its power to console and satisfy the hungry human heart. We believe that our doctrine is the doctrine of the future, and that it is worthy of careful study, and of unqualified acceptance.

ARTICLE VII.

MELANCHTHON AS THEOLOGIAN.

By George F. Behringer, D. D.

The foundation of Melanchthon's literary culture was laid in humanistic study. He lived and moved in this classical circle in all the branches of learning he investigated, both at Heidelberg and at Tuebingen.

It was not until he had completed the whole course of philosophical and philological studies, as then known,—to say nothing of his pursuits in law and medicine, not until he had received the Master's degree (1514), that he turned his attention to the study of theology. He did this, partly to comply with the wishes of his parents, partly of his own inclination, from a practical, moral point of view, as he himself said: "I am conscious that I never pursued the study of theology for any other reason than to better my life."

He attended the theological lectures at Tuebingen but experienced no real satisfaction in the vain speculation and dialectic casuistries of the prevailing scholastic theology, as when one of its monkish instructors attempted to portray the doctrine of the Trinity on the blackboard! He profited more from his private study of the Holy Scriptures in the original, as well as from his reading the writings of the Church Fathers,—soon convinced that genuine biblical knowledge differed widely from that imparted in the university lecture room.

Melanchthon was at this time (1514–1518) an instructor (Repetent) in the theological seminary (Stift), and otherwise engaged in classical, literary work, but he neither taught, nor lectured in, theology. Hence it can not be said that he developed in his own mind any special theological system, or tendency. On the contrary, up to the time of his removal to Wittenberg (1518), he was repelled, rather than attracted, by the prevalent theology, controlled by the thought of Reuchlin and Erasmus,

that the Church might be reformed by the revival and influence of humanistic studies.

It is generally known that Melanchthon was called to Wittenberg, as Professor of Greek, on the recommendation of his grand-uncle, Reuchlin. But it is not so well understood that Spalatin had earnestly recommended and that Luther had heartily endorsed another candidate. This was Peter Mosellanus, professor of Greek and Latin in the university of Leipzig. The decision was left with the Elector, who doubtless felt himself under obligation to accept Reuchlin's recommendation, since he had applied to the latter for a proper candidate.

On what a slender thread hung the appointment of Melanchthon and his future coöperation with Luther! And what might have been the result had Mosellanus been selected, who, according to Luther's subsequent testimony, afterwards developed a strong Erasmian tendency! Undoubtedly, an overruling and controlling Providence directed the course of affairs!

Yet some have maintained that, without the influence of Luther, Melanchthon would not have advanced far beyond the path of the new classical learning, contenting himself with scholastic eminence alongside of Reuchlin and Erasmus. His inaugural address at Wittenberg (1518) is an index of the bent of his mind, as well as of his sphere of work. He lectured upon philosophical and philological themes, and his exegetical discourses upon New Testament authors were grammatical rather than theological. His Master's degree (equivalent to the present Ph. D.) restricted him to the philosophical faculty.

It was the mighty influence of Luther's cause and personality that led Melanchthon to a profounder study of the Holy Scriptures; that assisted him to a personal acquaintance with the Evangelical doctrines of salvation; that induced him to devote his life exclusively to the work of the Church and the school; and that enabled him to comprehend that the deliverance of the Church, as well as of the individual, could only be accomplished through the Gospel, though the classical learning might be of material assistance. And yet this transfer, or addition, in the line of study and occupation, was not a sudden, radical change.

It was brought about by circumstances in the progress of the Reformation movement.

The first decided impulse which Melanchthon received in this new direction was his experience as witness and counsellor at the Leipzig disputation. In his account to a university friend, Œcolampadius, he exposed the weakness of the Roman Catholic champion, Dr. Eck. The latter replied in a savage attack upon the Wittenberg "grammarian," whom he accused of ignorance in theology. Melanchthon, in turn, delivered an able answer, vindicating the supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures, and maintaining the necessity of their correct interpretation. This led to his receiving the well-merited degree of Bachelor of Theology (1519), and eventually to his transfer to the theological faculty (1526). Among the theses which he defended on the occasion of his promotion were the following: that it is truly catholic only to believe such articles as are founded in the Holy Scriptures; and that it is furthermore not heretical to reject the doctrine of transubstantiation.

All this was a remarkable achievement for one so young, and for one who had not received a strictly priestly training. The degree of Doctor of Theology he persistenly refused, declaring himself to be unworthy of so high an honor. He was never ordained to preach, and limited his efforts in this direction to Sunday morning expositions, in Latin, of the Gospels, for the benefit of foreign students, mostly Hungarians, unable to understand the German. The experience with Eck also led to an increased activity on Melanchthon's part in the delivery of exegetical lectures on New Testament books.

With each succeeding disputation and publication Melanchthon's attachment to Luther and his cause was strengthened. During the latter's temporary absence on the Wartburg, there fell on the former the whole burden of work and weight of responsibility. Yet in this storm and stress period he developed his "*Loci Communes*" (1st edition, December, 1521). It was the first attempt to systematize the theology of the Evangelical Church. What the "*Sentences*" of Peter Lombard were to the mediaeval Church, the "*Common Places*" were to the Church of

the new era. They were the outgrowth and the summary of his lectures on the Epistle to the Romans, and they partake somewhat of the characteristics of a confession of faith. In them he develops the doctrine of justification as "the sum and substance of Christian teaching, which all men ought to know." Luther said of it that, except the Scriptures, there was no work like this, and called it "an invincible little book, worthy not only of immortality, but also to be placed in the canon." Whilst it was Luther's teaching it was Melanchthon's composition, and his merit that he systematized Luther's doctrines, basing them upon the Scriptures. In this, as in all his following works, he stands forth as the scientific founder of the evangelical faith, as well as its defender against the theologians of the Roman Catholic Church. It is said that the "Common Places" passed through five revisions and more than thirty editions, and that they were used as a text book of theology long after Melanchthon's death.

In the first edition of the *Loci Communes* Melanchthon omitted the dogmas of God, the Trinity, Creation, the Person of Christ, all of which had theretofore been the favorite themes of the scholastic theologians, and paid the greater attention to the doctrines of man and his fall through sin. In this first edition he takes the extreme Augustinian predestinarian view, denying all freedom to the human will and man's ability to coöperate in the work of grace, in terms almost as strong as Luther used in his treatise against Erasmus in 1525. But in the later editions of the "*Common Places*" he modified these and other views, teaching human coöperation in the work of conversion and sanctification, and "throwing the responsibility of perdition upon the disobedient will of the sinner."

Luther was dissatisfied with Melanchthon's division of time between the philosophical and theological faculties. He plead with Spalatin to secure Melanchthon's release from all but theological lectures, especially since he was receiving the paltry sum of 100 Gulden (about $400 in present values) for his double work. But Melanchthon himself was not willing to do so, and would rather have given up his theological lectures, for he held

that the future theologians of the Church should be well versed in the original languages of the Holy Scriptures. His refusal to comply with Luther's request was the more remarkable as an evidence of his unselfishness, when it is remembered that his theological lectures were crowded, whilst his philosophical and philological discourses were not so well attended.

But Luther persisted, knowing full well Melanchthon's ability and desiring his powerful assistance in the work yet to be accomplished. Luther appealed to the Elector to exert his influence. The latter responded by raising Melanchthon's salary to the amount of 100 Gulden; but without effect. Once more Luther appealed to his co-worker and to his civil ruler. The Elector responded by definitely appointing Melanchthon as full professor of theology (1526), with the increased compensation already promised, in addition to his professorship of Greek. Finally he yielded, and to the close of his earthly career filled this double position, classical professor and lay theologian.

The necessity of confirming the practical work of the Reformation led to a request, on the part of the Elector, to prepare a plan of instruction for the inspection of the schools and churches in the electorate. Two difficulties were in the way: it was necessary to establish a basis for reform in government without involving organic separation from the Roman Catholic Church, and plainly to express the fundamental truths of the Gospel without indulging in polemics against Roman Catholic errors. Melanchthon was entrusted with this important work (1527). In a masterly manner he presented the teachings of the Evangelical Church, devoting eighteen chapters to Christian doctrines, commenting on the Ten Commandments, the correct manner of Christian Prayer, of Tribulation, of the Sacrament of Baptism, and of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. Luther warmly approved of the contents of these articles.

Melanchthon's contention at the Diet of Speyer (1529), that the Zwinglians should not be condemned without a hearing, did not involve their fraternal recognition; for this he had denied to them at Marburg. And later, at Augsburg, he would have nothing to do with the Reformed elements and their confessions.

Aside from fundamental theological differences, he was not in sympathy with their political tendencies, nor with Zwingli's admixture of philosophy with religion.

Melanchthon can not justly be claimed by the Reformed as one of their representative theologians. True, Calvin declared that he was as intimately connected with Melanchthon, theologically, as he was with his own bowels, organically! Yet nothing was farther from Melanchthon than the controlling principles of Calvin and his type of Reformed theologians, such as: the abstract enforcement of scripture authority, the unhistoric treatment of church doctrines, the emphasizing of congregational rights against ministerial authority, and the bare, formless, so-called spiritual order of worship.

The crowning excellency of Melanchthon's theological work was his part in the composition of what has been justly termed "one of the most splendid productions of the human mind—a masterpiece of Christian learning," the Confession of Augsburg. "In sentiment firm and evangelical it exhibits the theology of Luther, who, as Kahnis says, is the author of its contents; in tone, mild and conciliatory, it reflects the gentle spirit of Melanchthon, who, as likewise Kahnis says, is the author of its form." * * "In itself considered the Augsburg Confession is in part a re-assertion of the doctrines of Christianity, as taught in and by the historical, Catholic, Apostolic Church, and in part a protest against the corruptions of Rome." (Rev. Prof. J. W. Richard, D. D.)

The Apology of the Augsburg Confession (published in 1531), of which Melanchthon was the sole author and composer, exhibits his own spirit and method of treatment. It presents with great thoroughness and scientific learning, in direct and positive terms, based upon the Scriptures and human experience, a triumphant refutation of the attacks upon the Augustana.

For thirty years the theological conflict raged about Melanchthon's person and work; until 1546, as the faithful coadjutor of the master-spirit, Luther; and from 1546 to 1560, as the surviving leader, the inheritor of the sacred trust, the furtherance of

gospel truth. "Diets," "conferences," "confessions," "interims," etc., succeeded each other in an almost endless chain! In peace and war, in pestilence and distress, among contending princes and quarrelsome theologians, in family troubles and university difficulties, burdened by a voluminous correspondence and straitened by a constant draft upon a generous hospitality,—it is a marvel that a mild spirit in a frail body could so long bear the strain!

In his endeavors to reconcile opposing tendencies he made concessions to all; and yet not from lack of principle, nor from want of conscientious convictions. It cannot be proven that he wilfully sacrificed any vital element of gospel truth. If any one of the so-called fighting theologians had defended the Lutheran cause, from 1530 to 1560, in the many conferences with Romanists, Calvinists and Zwinglians, it would have been said: no wonder there is no satisfactory result. But that the irenical Melanchthon did not suceed, is evidence sufficient that a harmonious coöperation of the conflicting forces was simply impossible. Thence forward separate church organizations, representing distinct organic doctrinal tendencies, became a historic necessity.

Whatever errors of judgment, mistakes in action, or modifications of doctrine he committed, were the outcome of the controlling principles which dominated his theological thinking. He was a many-sided, thoroughly educated man. He was naturally averse to harsh treatment and extreme measures. His manifold intercourse with the world had confirmed in him a constitutional tendency not to insist arbitrarily upon the highest results, but to seek the best possible terms under surrounding circumstances. His classical humanitarianism preserved him from fanatical iconoclasm, as well as from dogmatic excesses, though it did not seem to shield him from the mad hatred of extreme partisan theologians. This principle influenced his theological methods.

It has been well said that Melanchthon's theological world of thought sprang from Luther's soul. But he made it his own and gave to it scientific form and expression. The Protestant principle of free investigation and Scripture research found in

him a practical advocate. Hence his dogmatic system was not a fixed and finished production, but ever subject to revision according to his expanding knowledge and increasing light. The character of his mind was flexible, progressive, scholarly. He was preserved from scholastic speculations and philosophical vagaries by his practical moral and religious common sense!

Melanchthon was no original speculative theologian, in that he developed a perfect system from one controlling idea or doctrine; he was neither speculative nor mystical. Neither was he an abstract theorizer. In fact, he often avoids difficult theological problems and contents himself with that which tends to edification, and which is practically useful and intelligible. His was a receptive nature, which sought and appropriated rich treasures from church traditions, historic writings, and present developments, subjecting all to the touch-stone of the Scriptures. He aimed to mentally digest and theologically systematize the gospel truths which the Reformation brought to light, for the purpose of instruction and edification. He was clear and true; preëminently a teacher, *the* teacher of his nation.

Peculiar to Melanchthon is his view of the Church, not only as an assembly of saints, but as the highest moral communion on earth. The Church must be active in cultivating spiritual righteousness, and hence must have a real existence corresponding to her divine purpose. Hence the peace of the Church transcends in importance the interests of controversy, for without her tranquillity there can be no growth along this line. The necessity of a united church organization, the historic continuity of her development, the meaning of churchly authority, found in him a ready advocate. Firmly and deeply rooted as he was in the Scriptures, he viewed the Church, its government, doctrines and cultus with œcumenical eyes and a conservative spirit. He remained in connection with the historic life of the Christian Church of all the ages, convinced that any party or tendency that seeks nothing in the past has nothing to look for in the future. It was this conservative, œcumenical spirit which animated Melanchthon in his dealings with the Roman Catholic and different Protestant parties, and which renders intelligible

his concessions on the right hand and on the left, so long as the continuity of the historic Church life might be preserved on the basis of gospel truth.

This feeling for and attachment to the Church Melanchthon had inherited from a pious ancestry. His father, on his death bed (1507), forseeing the troublous times that were coming, solemnly exhorted his loved ones never to separate themselves from the membership of the Church. And his mother, on the occasion of his last interview with her (1529), gave utterance to her anxiety as to his standing in the Church, whose petitions she still offered. Finding nothing superstitious or unscriptural in them, she received from him the assurance that he had not forsaken the true Church of Christ, and that she might continue to adhere to what she had believed and practiced. Moved by this feeling of filial respect for the past, and animated by a living consciousness of his connection with the saints of all ages, Melanchthon could sincerely repeat, to his dying day, the prayer of his Lord and Master: "That they may all be one, even as thou, Father, art in me." It was for this reason that he was conservative in matters of worship and government, rejecting whatever might be in direct conflict with the word of God.

Melanchthon agrees with Luther in the doctrine of the universal priesthood of all believers, and is himself a true priest of God, though not ordained by the hands of man. To him the office of the ministry is divinely appointed, and in its historical growth it has developed a form of government which he sought to preserve. If his counsels had prevailed the episcopal order would in all probability have been continued in the Evangelical Churches of Germany, not as of divine right, but as of human arrangement and practical utility. As late as 1559 he indulged the hope that the episcopate, with the aid of provincial synods, would reëstablish a united national church, or churches, in Germany. The theory which did prevail, the king or prince being the supreme bishop; the consistory, an executive committee; and the superintendents, local church inspectors, has not tended to the development of the Church's powers and abilities. For the most part the state has used the Church to subserve its own

ends. The establishment of local and provincial synods, during the present century, has mitigated the evils of the old arrangement, but it has not abolished them. The Evangelical Churches of Germany are in the hands of the state.

Personally, in his dealings with the civil rulers and the theological leaders, Melanchthon occupied a unique position. And because of his conservative, irenical and œcumenical disposition he commands the respect of Christendom. The threefold principle which controlled him as a man, a scholar, and a theologian, may be termed Evangelical Knowledge, Evangelical Mediation, Evangelical Union.

ARTICLE VIII.

DIVINE HEALING, OR FAITH CURE.

By Rev. William E. Hull, A. M.

That the mind acts upon the body through its three-fold states of intellect, emotion and volition is a fundamentally recognized fact. This truth, often admitted, at times forgotten, and perhaps more frequently neglected, is a basal thought in the consideration of the subject of divine healing. That the state of the mind exerts an enormous influence, for good or evil, upon the body with which it is associated, extending to sensations, movements and organic functions, must be admitted without controversy.

THE INFLUENCE OF MIND ON THE BODY.

This principle was recognized in medico-therapeutics more than a century ago. Muzer, in a medical work published in Germany in 1771 writes: "Expectation of the action of a remedy often causes us to experience its operation before-hand." John Hunter, an Englishman, in his lectures on surgery (1786–7), delivered a few years later than the appearance of Muzer's work in Germany, declared: "I am confident that I can fix my attention to any part until I have a sensation in that part." Johannes Müller as decidedly as John Hunter expresses himself in

regard to the influence of expectation in these words: "It may be stated as a general fact, that any state of the body, which is conceived to be approaching and which is expected with certain confidence, will be prone to ensue, as a mere result of that idea." He only makes one condition, namely, "if it do not lie beyond the bounds of possibility." Thus, we notice, that Müller admits the induction of physical derangement of the body by the power of the imagination, while Muzer claims that expectancy in the imagination often causes the action of a remedy to be experienced beforehand.

These principles of psycho-physical action and reaction have been developed to voluminous proportions in our own day by distinguished minds in the medical profession.

Dr. Baird, an English authority (1841) by his investigations of the influence of the mind upon the body, gives this statement as to the influence of the imagination, or expectation: The oftener patients are hypnotized from association of ideas and habit, the more susceptible they become, and in this way they are liable to be affected *entirely* through the imagination. Thus, if they consider or imagine that there is something doing, although they do not see it, from which they will be affected, they will become affected: but on the contrary, the most expert hypnotist in the world may exert all his endeavors in vain, if the party does not expect it, and mentally and bodily comply and thus yield to it."

Dr. Daniel H. Tuke, M. D., F. R. C. P., LL. D., of our own day in his work on the "Influence of the Mind on the Body," says: "The imagination in its broad medical sense, which when properly understood and guided, is a complex mental power of the greatest interest and importance. With this form of imagination are closely associated expectation, belief, faith, imitation, sympathy and hope, some of these states involving the feelings more than others. The most superficial examination of the sense in which the term imagination is employed by metaphysicians on the one hand, and popularly and medically on the other will reveal the wide difference which exists between the two. In truth, as regards the present inquiry it signifies in pop-

ular and medical language that a man imagines certain bodily phenomena to have occurred which have not: or it is meant that certain bodily phenomena, which really have occurred, owe their existence solely to the influence of his imagination. The signification of the term contained in the first clause is too often assumed to be the whole truth. That the second clause is almost, if not altogether, lost sight of. Because effects are produced and cures performed by means of a mental condition called the imagination, it is constantly assumed that these results are imaginary, in other words, that they are 'all fancy.' This is much to be deplored, and one of the objects we have in view is to dispel so mischievous an error. It is generally implied that these phenomena are of a merely functional character, more or less dependent on the state of the mind, more especially the will, and that a change of mental condition has been naturally followed by a change in the phenomena, although apparently physical. Such is the broad definition of the imagination as it presents itself to the mind, when employed in reference to medical facts of *every-day occurrence.* It matters little to the patient by what name the remedy is called, whether 'imagination' or some of the many 'pathies' of the day. It is emphatically a case in which, 'a rose by any other name will smell as sweet.' But to the practitioner it ought to matter a great deal: it ought to be a question of extreme interest."

Dr. Tuke gives as an illustration of his definition, one which may be easily grasped by the common mind, which is as follows: "When a person, on swallowing a bread pill in the belief that it possesses aperient properties, is purged, it is said to be through his imagination, the mental condition present yielding, on analysis, a definite direction of thought to the intestinal canal, such leading idea exciting the same peristaltic action as would have been induced by castor oil. By the fictitious pill, an idea is suggested to the mind, which recalls the sensation experienced on a former occasion, when a real pill was taken: this central sensation, which is referred to the peripheral terminations of the sensory nerves of the intestines is reflected on to the motor nerves supplying the muscular walls of the alimentary canal,

and they contract in consequence. It is true that in most instances the effect produced would not be so sure, or so great, as when the action of the intestinal muscles is directly excited by purgatives."

THE INFLUENCE OF THE HIGHER MENTAL STATES—ALL REFLEXIVE.

I could at length portray the results of the mind's effect upon the body by the phases of the imagination under the states of expectation, belief, faith, imitation, sympathy and hope, but in the limits of this article must confine my pen to a few indications that will be food for thought.

Probably no simpler example of the power of expectation can be given than the one so common in occurrence, when medicine is confronting the patient, who exclaims, "The thought of taking it makes me sick." When belief is intense, the imagination arises from a mere idea, image or conception, to an irresistible conviction. Doubt is excluded and faith is all powerful. Sympathy and imitation are twins. A mind *en rapport* with another mind illustrates this statement. One who sympathizes with another is likely to experience in himself the same conditions. "We laugh with those who laugh and weep with those who weep." And if one gape, when he sees another gape, it is because the idea is forcibly presented to his mind, and thus produces analogous acts. We may simply think of the act, and the same effect is produced. There! I have while I write. I wonder how far the contamination will extend to my readers. Many will recall the old story of the wager of a wag that he could go into a bar-room and cause every person to yawn. He won the wager by entering the room and stretching himself and yawning with audible accompaniment until every one became infected. Hope, in its limitation to this world, caused St. Paul in addressing the Corinthians to say: "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable," while Cowper mediates thus:

> "Hope! let the wretch once conscious of the joy,
> Whom now despairing agonies destroy,
> Speak, for he can tell, and none so well as he,
> What treasures centre, what delights in thee."

Without hope in the imagination the world becomes a desert, the present a barren waste, the body a withered leaf.

ERRONEOUS LIMITATION OF MIND.

A common error is the limitation of the power of influence of the mind upon the body to the function of the will, but eminent medico-psychical authority makes the influence three times three-fold, substantiated by unimpeachable proofs, which complexity of influences may be indicated by the following formula:

Intellect upon	Voluntary Muscles, Involuntary Muscles, Organic Functions.
Emotions upon	Voluntary Muscles, Involuntary Muscles, Organic Functions.
Volition upon	Voluntary Muscles, Involuntary Muscles, Organic Functions.

Sir John Forbes, who thoroughly investigated the use of this force in the cure of disease, declares that "nature can cure diseases without assistance from art." He adduces, as a proof, that cure, among uncivilized nations of ancient and modern times, under the sole influence of magic charms, or other practices, has been effective.

In such a broad investigation into psycho-physical phenomena it becomes a settled principle that the influence of mind upon body is no transient power. Dr. Tuke summarizes such investigations into two conclusions, as follows:

1. "That in *health* it may exalt the sensory functions, or suspend them altogether: excite the nervous system so as to cause the various forms of convulsive action of the voluntary muscles, or depress it so as to render them powerless: may stimulate or paralyze the muscles of organic life and the processes of nutrition and secretion causing even death.

2. "That in *disease* it may restore the functions which it takes away in health, re-innervating the sensory and motor

nerves, exciting healthy vascularity and nervous power, and assisting the *vis medicatrix naturae* to throw off diseased action or absorb morbid deposits.

These psycho-therapeutic principles as laid down by the medical profession are eminently essential to an understanding of this question from an ecclesiastical standpoint.

VALID LIMITATIONS.

That imagination and faith can and do exert some influence over disease no one can dispute. The great question is, What is the extent of this influence; what are its limitations?

The inquiry has two practical bearings: one on the practical employment of this power in medicine, and the other on the truth of alleged miraculous cures.

The intelligent physican recognizes and admits these psycho-therapeutic principles, but says that, "faith can never be placed on a par with the action of a drug like jalap, the effect of which is certain and independent of faith or belief, which will act equally upon the intelligent as upon the ignorant, whereas faith can not be resorted to in a case in which the patient possesses such knowledge as prevents his power to believe that he will be cured by *nil.* He may know very well that faith alone will cure, as an abstract truth, but for himself he cannot have faith in faith alone. As a fact medical men are least easily relieved by medicine, because they want faith and are too thoughtful."

An eminent medical friend has set before my mind this distinction, that while functional disorders more readily yield to the influence of mind power, yet, that there is little or no power exerted for restoration in cases of organic disease. Again, that functional disorders have their duplicate symptoms in organic diseases, and that it is at times difficult in diagnosis to determine whether the trouble is functional or organic. Then, if this be difficult for a skilled practitioner, how much more so for the faith healer to determine the name he gives to the disease he claims to have cured by special power from God! Can we not see how easily it would be for him to say he had cured an organic dis-

ease, when he had only read the malady from the duplicate symptoms of some functional disorder?

FAITH-HEALING.

The faith-healers ignore these principles and ascribe all curative power to divinity, conditioned only by the means employed in apostolic times, and as declared in James 5 : 14, 15 : "Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick and the Lord shall raise him up: and, if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him."

Their position is stated succinctly by one of their leading representatives, R. Kelso Carter, as follows: "'Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day and forever,' is a tremendous declaration. Now, we have seen, that the promises of God most undeniably contain the assurance of physical health, on condition of obedience. These promises have not been outlawed by time. We cannot throw them away without sacrificing the decalogue and the moral law. An unbroken line of leaders, kings and prophets carry them down to the present gospel dispensation, and they are ours to-day. In 2 Corinthians 1 : 20 we read, 'For all the promises of God in him are yea, and in him Amen, unto the glory of God by us.' These are included in the all, therefore they are yea and Amen in Christ, and therefore are based upon his vicarious atonement. The conditions to-day are the same as of old. *We must believe and obey.* Belief is faith, and obedience is works. 'Faith without works is dead,' so belief and simple obedience cannot be separated. When Naaman joined his obedience to his belief, and dipped in Jordan, faith and works were united. It is ever so."

THE PRACTICE.

From the same authority I quote a resumé of the practice of faith healing:

1. "Faith healers believe in the use of means. The scriptural means are always employed: (1) Laying on of hands; (2)

Anointing with oil; (3) The prayer of faith. They also believe in occasional leadings of the Spirit to employ other means, which may be inherently efficacious or not."

2. "No one is advised by any prominent leader or teacher to lay aside all medicines, unless he can do so with perfect spontaneity. Forced abstinence is will power, not faith."

3. "Faith in the patient is regarded as necessary, when the individual is responsible, even the man 'borne of four' and let down through the roof had to obey the command to rise. Rare exceptions are known where the individuals have not been aware of the prayer offered in their behalf. These can be included under general answers to prayer. They are certainly conclusively against the supposition of any subjective condition of the patient."

4. "A perfect consecration of the whole spirit, soul and body is strongly urged. It would be almost blasphemous to ask for healing with any other view than the entire devotement to God of the renewed powers. Hence the universal experience of spiritual blessings in those who seek to be healed."

5. "Inquirers are instructed to believe that they do receive, when the Spirit witnesses within, that their consecration and obedience are complete, and the prayer has been offered. 'What things soever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them,' is the warrant for acting out the belief: that is, acting as if you were well. The leaders in this movement have themselves received life and health while following this same plan of action and therefore give this advice with all knowledge and honesty."

6. "The laying on of hands, prayer, and anointing are distinctively taught to be of no efficacy in themselves, any more than Jordan was to Naaman. But it is held that 'to obey is better than sacrifice.' "

7. "Those who fail to get saved, and those who fail to be healed, afford no argument against the continuance of preaching or praying. Lists of failures are not kept in either case; and the real reason lies in the fact that the doctrines of Chris-

tianity are not founded on phenomena, but upon the word of God alone."

8. "All who weigh the meaning of words counsel the use of such terms as will be mutually intelligible. A man who is exercising faith, but whose symptoms continue, is advised to say I believe, and not I feel."

9. "It is taught that Satan can tempt to sickness precisely as he can tempt to inward sin, by producing a symptom. He can consistently advise the use of medicine to one who is striving to fix his faith upon God alone: especially when he thinks that the remedy will prove unavailing. In any case such action is more consistent in him than that of those good people who profess to believe that it is the will of God for them to suffer, and at the same time spend time and wealth for every conceivable medicine in the attempt to defeat that will by getting well."

10. "Finally, it is distinctively taught that divine healing, like every branch of salvation, is a matter of personal experience: and as such is not susceptible of perfectly logical explanation to the unbeliever. To him all such things are 'foolishness' but to us who believe they become 'the power of God.' Every saved or healed man can testify from his heart: 'One thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see,' though he may utterly fail to convince the Scribes or Pharisees."

MR. CARTER'S CONCLUSION.

"True or false, there is no belief rising more swiftly before the churches everywhere than that of Divine Healing. There are over thirty 'faith homes' in America to-day. In England, and on the continent of Europe, can be found a larger number, some of them commodious institutions, with a history of many decades of years. In June, 1885, an international conference on this subject assembled in London, composed of delegates from all parts of the world: and the great agricultural hall was taxed to its utmost to accommodate the serious crowds that flocked to hear. During the last two seasons a number of conventions have been held in New York, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Pittsburg, Detroit and elsewhere, in all of which divine healing

has claimed an important part. The mass of evidence offered, the multitude of witnesses arising, and the words of Scripture on the subject, demand at least a respectful hearing and invite the closest scrutiny into the doctrine and practice of divine healing."

PHENOMENA OF REMARKABLE CURES.

No one of intelligence can be so irrational as to deny the phenomena of remarkable cures, which are beyond the power of the human mind to clearly define.

Prince Hohenlohe, born in 1794 in Waldenberg, and afterward a Roman Catholic Bishop of Sardica, no doubt, effected many cures in his remarkable career.

Nor was it a mere myth or superstition that Father Matthew was successful in relieving the sick.

Knock Chapel in Ireland undoubtedly was a Mecca from which much suffering humanity departed with renewed powers of being.

Many of the multitudes of pilgrims infirm and disabled, who have journeyed full of faith to the grotto of "Our Lady" at Lourdes in France, "where in 1858 the Virgin Mary is believed in the Catholic world, to have revealed herself to a peasant girl," have been cured of diseases, with which medical practitioners have been unsuccessful. There is, perhaps, no ground for denial that the use of the water from this spring, which is conveyed to distant parts of the world, is followed by many recoveries.

Throughout Catholic countries there are records, legends and crutches of those who, as Dr. Tuke says, "there is no reason to doubt have been cured and relieved of contracted joints by the prayers offered at some shrine, or by the supposed efficacy of their relics."

Nor is there any reason to deny that cures have been effected "without the use of medicine, and in answer to prayer," by the distinguished leaders of the so-called faith-healers of Protestantism, among whom are counted Rev. W. E. Boardman with his "Nursery of Faith" or "Bethshan," as the home is called in the North of London; Dr. Charles Cullis, of Boston, who has made

the resort at Old Orchard, Maine, famous; and Rev. A. B. Simpson with his retreat at New York called "Barachah Home."

LIMITATIONS.

1. The "faith-healers" cannot parallel the mighty works of Christ, or his apostles. Yet they claim that "the age of miracles is not past." That the Master never contemplated or proposed any post-apostolic gulf of impotence and failure, but that man's unbelief and sin have made it. The Church's own corruption has caused it, but that Christ never desired or provided for it. Nor should aught be diminished by his seeming absence: for "greater works shall ye do, because I go to my Father."

2. The faith-healers can exhibit no supremacy over pagans, magnetizers, spiritualists, clairvoyants, mind-curers, etc. To this it is replied by Dr. Simpson: "We will not deny that while some of the manifestations of spiritualism are undoubtedly frauds there are many that are unquestionably supernatural and are produced by forces for which physical science has no explanation. It is no use to try to meet this terrific monster spiritualism, in which, as Joseph Cook says, is, perhaps the greatest 'if' of our immediate future in England and America, with the the hasty and shallow denial of the facts, or their explanation as tricks of legerdemain. They are undoubtedly real and superhuman. They are 'spirits of devils working miracles' gathering men for Armageddon. They are the revived forces of the Egyptian magicians, the Grecian oracles, the Roman haruspices, the Indian medicine men. They are not divine, they are less than omnipotent—but they are more than human. Our Lord has expressly warned us of them: and their very existence renders it the more imperative that we should be able to present against them—like the rod of Moses, which swallowed the the magicians' and at last silenced their limited power—the living forces of a holy Christianity in the physical as well as the spiritual world."

Surely this is a weak mystical accounting for phenomena which psycho-medical authority places within the realm of reason and law.

3. The faith-healers must embrace the "gift of tongues" and "power to overcome malignant poisons," according to Christ's last promise in Mark, ch. 16 : 17, 18, "And these signs shall follow them that believe: In my name shall they cast out devils: they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover."

To the limitation, if the gift of tongues has ceased, so in the same way has the power over disease, they reply: "We cheerfully accept the severe logic; we cannot afford to give up one of the promises. We admit our belief in the presence of the Healer in all the *charismata* of the Pentecostal church. We see no reason why a humble servant of Christ, engaged in the Master's work, may not claim in simple faith the power to resist malaria and other poisons and malignant dangers: and we believe the gift of tongues was only withdrawn from the early Church as it was abused for vain display, or as it became unnecessary for practical use through the rapid evangelization of the world: and it will be repeated as soon as the Church will humbly claim it for the universal diffusion of the Gospel. Indeed instances are not wanting now of its apparent restoration in missionary labors both in India and Africa."

4. As to the many cases of failure, they reply: "That they may be accounted for through defective knowledge or unbelief, failure to follow consistently the teachings of the word and the Spirit, or for a deeper spiritual discipline—the same as failures in the spiritual life from the same or similar causes."

5. As to the claim that God made all means for our use, and has opened to man's mind remedial discovery, they reply: (1) God has not prescribed medicine. (2) He has prescribed another way in the name of Jesus. (3) The provisions of grace are of faith—not of works.

6. As to death, they reply: Why should faith go farther than God's word. The word places a limit to human life and all that scriptural faith can claim is a sufficiency of health and strength for our life-work, and within its fair limits."

RESUME.

I must draw these pros and cons to an end.

FIRST. By the caution of Dr. Tuke, who says: "Too frequently, no doubt, have combatants on this question debated the subject as if there were two rival camps in the field, as if, in short, there were no alternative between knavery and miracles: whereas if the principle of psycho-therapeutics be true the vast mass of alleged supernatural cures admit of other interpretation."

SECONDLY. By the conclusions of Rev. Dr. J. M. Buckley, a student of broad and deep research upon this question: (1) All the faith healers really can accomplish, can be paralleled without assuming any supernatural causes, and a formula can be constructed out of the elements of the human mind which will give as high average results as their prayers and anointings. (2) None can demonstrate that God cannot work through second causes, bringing about results which, when they come, appear to be entirely natural, but which would not have come, except through special providence, or in answer to prayer."

THIRDLY. Let it be remembered that the apostles did not heal all the sick, even among their friends. Paul said: "Trophimus I left at Miletus sick," and Matthew Henry truly remarks, "By which it appears that though the apostles healed all manner of diseases miraculously, for the confirmation of their doctrine, yet they did not exert that power upon their own friends, lest it should have looked like a collusion. None of their friends were ever delayed in receiving salvation through faith in Christ.

The apostles did not found faith-healing hospitals and make that work the chief interest and main attraction, even in their day, when medicine was not a science, and was little more than the art of nursing.

The gospel of healing—healing to the body as well as the soul—as a theory is certainly captivating, available and inexpensive, were it not for its limitations in practice.

In practice the faith-healers feed the mind upon impressions

and statements extravagant and mystical, which put the mint mark of fanaticism on their followers.

They discount true rational science and religion, which only preserve (in the words of Sidney Smith), "the intervals between churches and asylums as far as possible."

ARTICLE IX.

THE STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS OF THE CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR MOVEMENT.

By Rev. Edwin Heyl Delk.

It is a healthful moment in the history of a human soul when it pauses to consider the strong and weak elements of its personality. It is a sane and essential quality in generalship to acquaint oneself with the strong and weak points of one's fighting force. In neither case is it an hour of exaltation and dash. It is not a moment of laudation and flattery. It is a sober hour in which any soul pauses to estimate its forces and limitations, and balances the probabilities of victory or defeat.

The Christian Endeavor Society, like every other human institution, is not perfect in its organization, action, or spirit. To acknowledge that it has weaknesses may not be pleasant, but it points to a sober and prophetic adjustment of its splendid powers.

I do not care to write of the weaknesses as existing, but rather point them out as dangers threatening the movement.

The first danger I wish to caution against is *Phariseeism;* the second is *Egotism;* and the third is *Indifferentism.*

PHARISEEISM.

The Pharisees were an ancient Jewish party who paid scrupulous regard to tradition and to the observance of all external forms and ceremonies, and in so doing were led to separate themselves from the other Jews. They were formalists in religion. Henry Ward Beecher has thus defined the modern counter-part, "A Pharisee is one who worships instruments. Whoever believes that churches, or books, or institutions, or customs,

are more valuable than men is a Pharisee." In a word, Phariseeism is punctiliousness in the performance of the external duties of religion. Is this a danger in the Christian Endeavor Society? I think it is. The pledge which is the backbone of the Society, but only the armor of the Endeavorer, sets him apart as the member of a special order of Christians in the Church. The pledge makes certain specific, rightful demands of the members of a society, such as constant church-going, leading in public prayer, the public presentation of testimony in its religious gatherings, the daily reading of the Bible, and a monthly public consecration. These are rightful, but they are certainly not obligatory upon all Christians. Religion is something more than church-going, Bible-reading, leadership in prayer, speech-making and keeping pledges. These are the external signs of religious interest. A man may do them all and yet be as dry religiously as the bed of a mountain stream in January. The exaltation of the pledge, as the measure of fidelity, puts the emphasis on an external duty rather than on an internal state. There lies the danger of making a religious prig out of very ordinary material. The monthly consecration service may become the purely formal performance of an expected duty. The spirit of Phariseeism quickly follows the punctilious performance of mere external requirements. It is not alone the work of the meeting, but the life outside, that determines the genuineness of one's consecration to Christ. The "holier than thou" fever is easily contracted. Beware!

EGOTISM.

The Christian Endeavor Society is not an end in itself. It exists for the upbuilding of the Church. The United Society has grown to such proportions and made its gatherings and publications so attractive, that we face the danger of making it the chief point of attraction in all our Christian institutions. "We are *the* society of the Church" is a frequent claim made by this young giant. It has come so quickly to place and power, that the older and more staid societies of the Church are overawed by its bumptiousness. The earlier young people's organizations,

such as the King's Daughters, the King's Sons, the Children's Mission Bands, and the various aid societies are threatened with absorption by this insatiable young Hercules of the Church. Some of the Christian Endeavor Societies have actually proposed to enlist all the members of these other societies under its multitudinous committees, and put them to work with higher efficiency. Modesty is not a characteristic of a number of our societies. From the claim "We are *the* society of the Church" it is not a far cry to—"We are *the* Church." I do not think any society openly makes any such ridiculous claim, but there is a *danger* that in some congregations many of the young people may be made to think so by the conduct of the Endeavor society. Let me propose a revelatory test. If you could attend but one meeting on Sunday evening, endeavorer, your society's meeting, or the church service, which would you attend? To which are you pledged first? To the church service, of course, but how many, without stopping to think, imagine that it would be their first duty to attend the Endeavor meeting.

INDIFFERENTISM.

It seems strange that a society so filled with enthusiasm should be indifferent to any essential feature of church life. I do not bring indifferentism as a charge but present it as a *danger* arising from the very largeness of the society's aims. First, indifference towards denominational history, life and responsibility. The first distinction of the society is its interdenominational affiliations. This is commendable, but it is easy to neglect the duty close at hand for the dazzling possibility of the far future. Although the framers of the society's pledge and constitution emphasize denominational and congregational loyalty, yet, of necessity, their publications and great conventions can not countenance, or present, any denominational teaching or propaganda. They expect the pastor and leaders of the local societies to take care of the denominational training and work. Now the truth is, the pastor, or leaders, have little or no opportunity in the average endeavor meeting to do any such thing. The topics and service are so arranged that the introdution of historical or

doctrinal instruction seems like an intrusion and creates a jar in the smooth running of the service. We all see how necessary it is that young people should be informed and interested in the history, the life, and the work of their respective denominations. Denominationalism is something which has its roots in great scriptural, historic and psychic differences of constitution. Belief always precedes conduct. For a man to say "one church is as good as another for me" is to declare himself good for nothing to any church. He is either ignorant of, or incapable of understanding, the genesis and genius of the four or five great divisions of Christendom.

There is danger of indifference to the authorized governing body of the Church *i. e.*, pastors and synods. A distinctly denominational society is amenable to the church council and the legislative bodies of the church, but the Christian Endeavor Society gets its first direction from an extra-denominational source. I do not call this a weakness, but I do point it out as a danger. The society has no organized will to consult beyond the directorship of the United Society. That the gentlemen composing that board have attempted no dictation in the point of creed, conduct, or work for the Society, is to the credit of their wisdom and unselfish spirit. But that there is danger of a false independency on the part of the Society, is patent to all thinking pastors. The matter lies largely in their own hands and it is well now and then to impose the legitimate authority of the Council and Synod upon the local organization.

I mention one other type of indifferentism which threatens not only the Endeavor Society but our Sunday-schools and other Young Peoples' organizations within the Church. I mean the superficial study and use of the Bible. Since Luther restored to the common people God's precious word, too many have counted themselves competent expounders of its great truths. The elemental facts of sin and salvation the average boy and girl can talk about intelligently, because they have a personal experience to illumine these great facts, but there are a score of other facts, historical, dogmatic, devotional, literary, exegetical that only the profound scholar can decide and present

in accurate form. Now to say I have been annoyed, yes pained, by the superficiality of so much lay and juvenile Biblical deliverances is putting the fact mildly. If we are to have the limp-backed Oxford editions expounded to us by callow youths, pray let us have a classical and philosophical annex to our Sunday-schools and association rooms for the scientific study of the original manuscripts. There are master students whose criticism, both "higher" and "lower," we must learn to respect. Let there be more thoroughness in the study of the great Book, and then our Endeavorers will be prepared to speak upon topics of which they now sometimes make sad havoc.

It is with lighter heart I now turn to consider the strong points in the Christian Endeavor movement. I think I have candidly presented the weaknesses of the society. The fact that, despite these dangers, it has grown and proved its power for good is proof apparent that its strong points overshadow its weaknesses.

The three points which I wish to present as elements of the society's power are, first, the recognition and utilization of the youth of the Church; the second, the emphasis which the society places on the universal obligation of Christian service; and third, the centralization of Jesus in the thought and life of both Church and State.

THE RECOGNITION AND UTILIZATION OF YOUTH.

Since the Reformation in Germany, children have received growing attention on the part of the Church. Francke, as far back as 1695, received the boys of his city into his study, and formed the first Sunday-school. Raikes, in London, a hundred years later, improved and persisted in the idea of a school for the poor of his city. The catechetical class of Presbyterianism, the Confirmation classes of the Episcopal Church, and the *Kinderlehre* of Germany have all conspired to educate the youth of the Church for service. But it is safe to say, that the recognition of their capacity for this service came reluctantly. They were treated as reservoirs, but no outlet was furnished for their pent up energies. They were considered a sort of magnificent

Niagara, beautiful and magestic to look upon, but too impetuous for utilization. Now that the Niagara rapids have been harnessed and whirl round those mighty turbines and dynamos of far reaching power and light, the Church has awakened to the fact that the unused energy of her youth can also be harnessed and do splendid service for Christ. The Christian Endeavor Society is not a catechetical class. The pastor is not the sole instructor. If his work has been well done many of his words will be re-echoed in the meetings of the Society. But the responsibility of the Society's service and growth is thrown upon the young shoulders of its membership. The Society is a frank and distinct appeal for religious culture. "The pill was not sugar-coated so deeply that its tonic qualities were entirely lost." The Society puts faith in the young people as an evangelizing force. It believes in the sincerity and the enthusiasm of the young. It believes that the Father's business can still be honored and expanded by the boy of twelve. The mutual training received in the business and prayer meeting fits every earnest young heart to become an ambassador for Christ in the school and counting-room. The Christian Endeavor Society is the electric feed-wire for many long lines of indispensable service.

THE UNIVERSAL OBLIGATION TO SERVICE.

The Church is now in the hands of the common people. If it is a failure, it is because the rank and file of its membership are negligent or hypocritical. In the past, many a dear old soul thought his religious duty done, when he came regularly to church, and contributed three dollars annually for the support of the pastor and the kingdom. An occasional public prayer, learned in early manhood, would now and then be contributed at the prayer meeting, together with a bag of apples at the annual donation party, but there his duty and his service ended. And to-day many a fashionable church-goer does less for the Christ of Calvary. In the midst of this halting, easy-going church life is sounded the bugle-call to universal, strenuous service. It calls upon every member of the church to light his torch, and march forward with the one common purpose of

glorifying the Captain of our salvation. No longer can men and women in Christ's Church he simply onlookers and feel comfortable in their cozy pews. Out into the streets and tenements, out into the hospitals and homes, out into the factory and alley, out into the sin and sorrow of life must we go to repeat his life of devotion, if we are to be his true disciples. The man with the one talent will be held as strictly to account as he with the five. Christian Endeavor has revitalized scores of congregations. When a thousand soldiers march over Brooklyn bridge they must break step, or the huge structure would be swayed out of position. Would to God we could so march our broken columns of the Church that they might forever break the mighty chords of sin.

THE CENTRALIZATION OF JESUS.

It is so easy to become absorbed in the secondary and tertiary affairs of religion. Each sect has its peculiar shibboleth to shout. Each party within a denomination has its pet scheme to carry out. Individual men have their religious hobbies to ride. In this conflict of opinion and spirit, it is very easy to centre one's attention and endeavor on matters of secondary importance and miss the heart-centre of Christian thought and life. Christianity has passed through several historic phases. Coming out of Judaism it carried with it a group of legalists who still made it largely a matter of commandments. Coming in contact with Greek thought its leaders sought to put in philosophical form its beliefs and emphasized the importance of the creed's exact statements. When it passed under the shadow of Rome, Christianity fell a victim to the militant and organizing passion of the national life. To have kept the eye steadily on Christ during all these heated discussions of rites, ceremonies, theological niceties and hierarchical adjustments of office, was beyond the power of the average man. Jesus was often smothered beneath dialectics, robes and councils. The contentions of the Early Church are our inheritance and we have added to them the post-Reformation divisions of Protestantism. What we need, in the midst of our social and denominational differ-

ences, is the exaltation of that Christ who is the creative centre of all Christian thought and life. This the Christian Endeavor Society is doing more thoroughly that any other young people's organization in Christendom. In the midst of our social and ecclesiastical, into the centre of our political and international life and thought, she has carried the Christ as the divine healer and leader of the sects and nations. In the city of Baltimore there now stands a copy of one of the most majestic and beautiful statues of the world. A gentleman of generous and thoughtful nature has placed beneath the rotunda of its far-famed Johns Hopkins Hospital a reproduction of Thorwaldsen's "The Divine Healer." There, facing the main doorway of that vast, radiating home of suffering, stands the pure, white figure of the soul's "Great Physician." The doctors and hurrying nurses, the slowly moving visitors, and above all the incoming, bleeding, helpless, hopeless sufferers, look up at the benign, silent figure and recall the living Jesus whose almighty power to heal and comfort gives him the eternal, central position in the midst of the world's science, art, and religion. Thus always the Christian Endeavor Society places him in the high centre of all religious difference and life. Beneath the glance of the exalted Christ we are beginning to actualize his declaration, "and all ye are brethren." Jesus has commanded brotherly love from the beginning, but any systematic attempt to realize it waited upon the Christian Endeavor Society. The one Master binds heart to heart. Christian unity is not Church unity, but the oneness of believers was the end for which Christ prayed, and this mission is the supreme glory of the Christian Endeavor movement, as it is the sure goal of Christian history.

ARTICLE X.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke. By the Rev. Alfred Plummer, M. A., D. D. pp. 590. $3.00.

In this volume of the "International Critical Commentary" we have at last a work that is worthy of being laid alongside of Meyer. Rivaling that prince of commentators in learning, insight, candor and textual analysis, it surpasses him in some important features, being free from Meyer's arbitrariness and occasional obscurity, and not dominated like him by pet theories of inspiration, eschatology and so forth. We know hardly which to admire the more, Dr. Plummer's inestimable enrichment of exegetical literature, or the graceful modesty which page after page confesses to limitations of knowledge, and admits the present inability of scholars to solve difficulties connected with the oracles of truth.

He is fully abreast of modern criticism, and skepticism and amply equipped to meet their assaults. He is convinced that the writer of the Third Gospel is identical with the writer of the Acts, and that the writer of both books is Luke the beloved physician. Adhering strictly to critical methods of interpretation, and making no attempt at the defense of dogmas, he recognizes that dogma is necessarily conspicuous in a commentary on any one of the Gospels, and he understands it to be a primary duty of a commentator to ascertain the convictions of the writer whose statements he undertakes to explain. "This is specially true of the Third Gospel, whose author tells us that he wrote for the very purpose of exhibiting the historical basis of the Christian faith."

With the frank confession of doubts respecting the exact import of certain passages or expressions, there is a refreshing positiveness respecting points which are sufficiently clear, and an emphatic assertion of the doctrinal significance of our Lord's teachings and miracles. A conservative temper animated by an evangelical spirit characterizes throughout the exposition of the text.

On the intellectual, moral and spiritual growth of the Child Jesus, Dr. Plummer holds that "His was a perfect humanity developing perfectly, unimpeded by hereditary or acquired defects. For the first time a human infant was realizing the ideal of humanity."

The existence of a personal devil can be denied "only on purely *a priori* grounds. To science the question is an open one, and does not admit of demonstration either way. But the teaching of Christ and his

Apostles is clear and explicit," and their teaching must be regarded as actual truth, unless they are chargeable with gross superstition, or with an unworthy accommodation to superstition.

Relative to the Sabbath, the subject on which Jesus antagonized the position of the Pharisees, Dr. Plummer claims not that he abrogated it, but that he has power to cancel the literal observance of it in order to perform or permit what is in accordance with its spirit. "The point here is that Christ as the representative of man defends man's liberty."

In the exposition of the words of Institution he says: "In taking this bread they in some real sense take his body."

On the development of the doctrine of Sheol it is claimed that in the apocryphal literature "Hades becomes practically the same as Gehenna." In the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus * * the doctrine of its being a place of retribution * * * could hardly be more clearly marked." There are special notes—twenty-two altogether, on topics to which attach peculiar difficulties, Demoniacal Possession, the Decree of Augustus, the Genealogy, the Narratives of the Resurrection, etc., etc.

An Index to the Notes, and an Index of Greek words are most commendable additions to a work which will prove an invaluable addition to the library of every true student of the word. E. J. W.

With Open Face. By A. B. Bruce, D. D., Glasgow, Scotland. pp. 257. $1.50.

This volume is a series of popular sketches of Christ as mirrored in the synoptic gospels. Nine of the thirteen chapters are reprinted from the *Expositor* where they first appeared. The book is one of rare charm, and will repay a careful study. If we may use a popular figure of the day, it is the development of selected scenes in our Lord's life and ministry from the original photographic plates of the Evangelists. The book is really a work of art, the author seeking, now to intensify, and now to make clearer and set in a new light,—but always from the view-point of the Gospel writer,—the leading scenes in Christ's public ministry. Sometimes, in his intense eagerness to illuminate, the author s imagination runs away with him. For example, as has been pointed out elsewhere, in the chapter, "Jesus longing for apt disciples." Dr. Bruce gives a rather startling interpretation of Matt. 11 : 25–30, making the whole a fragment of a soliloquy, a devotional meditation of our Lord, not meant for human ears. It is remarkable how the prayer shades off into the invitation, reminding us how real and deep was the relation between Christ and the Father;—but for anything beyond this there seems to be no contextual warrant. However, this is exceptional. The pictures are as a rule very inspiring, notably the latter ones. In the last chapter the author has attempted a "Christian Primer," a historical catechism on the life of Jesus for children, which we believe will warrant a fuller development. H. C. A.

Jesus Christ during his Ministry. By Edmond Stapfer, Professor in the Faculty of Protestant Theology at Paris. Translated by Louisa Seymour Houghton. pp. 265. Price, $1.25.

This is the second of a series of three books on the person, authority and work of Jesus Christ. The first, on Jesus Christ before His Ministry, was noticed in our January issue. In that it was claimed that Jesus in the very beginning of his ministry, "believed himself to be the Messiah." It is claimed in this that "the conviction of his Messianic dignity had been of slow growth," at least it seemed so. He is represented, in the early days of his ministry as "simply one of those itinerant preachers frequently to be met in Palestine at that time, trying to do some good, healing the sick, casting out demons, preaching the love of the Law [the law of love?], and each in his own way preparing for the coming of the Kingdom." In this language there is surely no hint of anything superhuman about the Christ. And there is none when he speaks of the miracles. He first considers the wonderful cures he wrought and finds nothing wonderful in them. Jesus was a Rabbi, and, like any other Rabbi, he must exercise the functions of a physician. "He often puts questions like a doctor who is concerned to inform himself as to the gravity of the case." "He commanded that food should be given the daughter of Jairus; it was as a medical prescription." His refusal to perform a cure when there was no faith was not a "refusal to perform an act which he might have performed if he had so willed; no, it was an impossibility." This will give an idea of the standpoint from which the author views Christ's whole work. Great as he was and wise as he was, Jesus ranks only as a great and wise *man*.

Contemporary Theology and Theism. By R. M. Wenley, D. Phil. (Glasgow), Professor of Theology in the University of Michigan. pp. 197. Price, $1.25.

This book is the outgrowth of a lecture delivered, several years ago, before the Glasgow University Theological Society. As Honorary President of that organization it became his "duty to deliver an address on certain aspects of contemporary theological inquiry." Portions of this lecture appeared in *The Thinker*, and repeated requests came to the author from students in Europe as well as the United States to put the whole of it in accessible shape. In meeting this demand Dr. Wenley expanded the treatment to such a degree that the lecture increased in size four-fold and now appears as a book instead of a review article or pamphlet.

After the introduction, four chapters are given to speculative theology, three to Ritschlian theology, five to the theistic problem, and in a concluding chapter the author discusses The Final Idealism. As Dr. Wenley was formerly Lecturer on Philosophy in the University of

Glasgow and is now professor of Philosophy in the University of Michigan, his discussion of contemporary theology, as might be expected, is of the philosophical cast rather than the theological.

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY, CHICAGO, ILL.

Theoretical Ethics. By M. Valentine, D. D., LL. D. pp. 227. $1.25.

It is with unmixed pleasure that we welcome this book. Every student that ever sat under Dr. Valentine's instruction in ethics has wished for a development of his lecture-notes in permanent form. This volume is the author's response to the importunity of former pupils. He will have their cordial gratitude, too. Few teachers are more beloved, few more esteemed for their work's sake. His former pupils will be proud to own him not only the trusted teacher of their college days, but of their maturer years as well.

The church has reason to thank Dr. Valentine for entering the disputed field of ethics at this critical period, and contributing so worthy a book, the result of many years of investigation, to the cause of truth and righteousness.

But apart from our personal and denominational interest in the volume before us, we rejoice in its spirit. We believe it is a positive contribution to the literature of ethics. We believe it will take rank with the best conservative thinking on the subject. Dr. Valentine was a teacher of ethics when the scientific and philosophical agitation resulting from the proclamation of the Darwinian idea had its rise. He has followed every modification of the conceptions of man and the world made by the new science, with patient, candid, critical investigation. Every pupil of his knows with what honesty of purpose he toiled through the voluminous scientific and philosophical literature of twenty-five years ago and since. The ethical idea lay on his heart. He believed it was the key to the theological positions of the young men who passed out of his class-room. As a teacher of theology he has pursued the subject with the same jealous interest. He believes that the time has come when the student of ethics can take his bearings with new confidence. He believes that the validity of the moral faculty, the reality of moral agency, and the responsibility of the moral judgment have not been impaired.

The book is a critical one in purpose and method. The method gives recognition to the empirical and metaphysical sides of the subject. No better or briefer summary of the work could be made than is given by the author in the preface: "Starting from the universal phenomenon of moral distinctions in life, it determines the conscience psychologically, as a rationally intuitive power discerning the moral distinction and the reality and authority of moral law. The implications of conscience and moral law necessarily become theistic. The metaphysical examination finds for the real phenomena of the subjective faculty the objective and abiding reality of the ethical law which the

faculty discerns, and the right or morally good itself so perceived as consisting proximately in a conformity of conduct with the relations of life in which moral requirement meets human freedom, and as ultimately grounded in the absolute and perfect source of the moral constitution of the universe. The movement carries to the conclusion of eternal and immutable moral law. The disclosure of revelation confirm the ethical law of the natural reason, completing the moral view and supplying, in the divine forces of Christianity, the proper dynamic for the realization of the ethical life."

The treatment moves on a high plain, is scholarly and comprehensive, and must serve to quicken personal responsibility—in a fine sweep of reasoning bringing even the intellect within the objects of moral judgment—and, from its devout spirit, to deepen Christian faith.

H. C. A.

LEA BROTHERS AND COMPANY, PHILADELPHIA.

A History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church. By Henry Charles Lea, LL. D. Three Vols. pp. 523, 514, 629.

That Mr. Lea has placed mankind anew under a debt of obligation which can never be fully discharged, will be readily admitted by every student of this trio of solid volumes of ecclesiastical history. The quality of his work need not be dwelt on here. The wealth of scholarship, the industrious zeal for accuracy and impartiality, the courage inspired by love of truth, the historical temper, the combination of excellencies by which his previous publications are distinguished, all appear on these pages with undiminished lustre.

The timeliness and the need of these discussions, Confession, Absolution, Indulgences, cannot be overestimated. There may be no relaxation of hostility to Romanism, but there is colossal ignorance of the details in the administration of Roman Catholic principles, and from this ignorance is begotten a most unfortunate misapprehension of the real errors of that system from which Protestantism has revolted. It could easily be demonstrated that some of the most deadly virus of Rome is doing its work unrecognized and unhindered in the bosom of Protestant communions, while some of the innocent and really commendable things in the old Church are continually warned against by ignorant alarmists, as if their use by Protestants were tantamount to the pollutions of the Scarlet Woman. Were pains taken to know the truth, the full truth of history, on the distinctive features of Roman Catholic theory and practice, we should have a sounder Protestantism as the result, and a larger measure of fraternal charity. The system so thoroughly and effectually handled here is without a parallel in its subjection of the intellect and conscience of successive generations to the domination of fellow mortals. And although the glare of modern light and the conscience of the Protestant world have undoubtedly wrought improvements, yet a system which admits of the confessional being

made a place of assignation, that authorizes a priest to grant absolution to his guilty paramour in their common sin, that entrusts the Keys of Heaven to the lecherous ministers of Satan, must be, as Luther declared it to be, a system of rottenness incapable of reform or purification.

Our author confines himself to historical interests. With little comment, or polemic, he allows the readers to draw their own conclusions, a privilege which they are not likely to forego. To avoid bias he has even abstained from consulting Protestant writers, confining himself exclusively "to the original sources and to Catholic authorities." And in this he has not consulted merely standard theological treatises, but has referred largely to popular works of devotion in which is found the practical application of theories enunciated by the masters of theology. By laborious investigations he traces the origin and the development of this sacerdotal structure which for centuries "subjugated Christendom beneath its vast and majestic omnipotence."

The few pages devoted to the subject of Confession and Absolution in the Lutheran and other Churches, form a most striking and edifying contrast to the papal institution, although it is not made as clear as it might be, how completely the diametrical opposition between Papal and Protestant principles comes here to the surface.

"Luther expressed his complete approval of auricular confession as useful and indeed necessary." "The Augsburg Confession lays stress on the fact that confession is strictly enforced among the Lutherans and that communion is given only to those examined and absolved." Even Zwingli "seems unable to divest himself entirely of the idea of human intervention, for, he adds, that to deny to a penitent the remission of a single sin is to serve as a delegate of the devil and not of God." And John Calvin teaches that "ministers as witnesses and sponsors render more assured the consciences of sinners, and thus are said to remit sins and absolve souls. General confession in church is most salutary. Private confession is prescribed by St. James, and though the apostle leaves the penitent free to choose, the pastor is the fittest confessor."

But note the world-wide difference between the Protestants and the Romanists, in the details and the import of Confession and Absolution. With the latter only a priest who has received specific and supernatural power can absolve, whereas Luther taught "Absolution can be had from any one, a brother or a neighbor, at any time and in any place, in the house or in the fields, and he who is asked for it has no right to refuse it." Such a view sounds the death-knell of all priestly usurpations and sets free the penitent from the indescribable tyranny of the confessional.

With the latter, again, faith is no requisite, the three recognized conditions being contrition, confession and satisfaction. "No one could know whether his contrition was sufficient." "Absolute faith

in pardon," was declared by Cajetan, "to be an impossibility," "we are not intended to feel certainty about it." "No one can have the absolute certainty of faith that he has obtained grace." Let the Romanist once have absolute certainty of salvation and the priest's power is forever gone.

With the Lutherans, per contra, faith in absolution was strenuously insisted on. "It is believed as a voice from heaven, and the believer is not tortured with doubts and distinctions, as in the Catholic Church. Penitential works are superfluous; faith is the one thing needful, and the believer is justified by his belief." "Melanchthon shows in the Apology how the Reformers had so improved the benefits of absolution and the power of the keys that many afflicted consciences gained consolation; they believed in the gratuitous remission of sins through Christ, and felt themselves fully reconciled to God through faith, while formerly all the strength of absolution was weakened by the doctrine of works." With the Lutherans private confession, left "wholly voluntary," and absolution being perfectly valid when received from a layman, proved a fountain of consolation to distressed consciences; as prescribed and enforced by Rome it was as Melanchthon calls it a "slaughter-house of conscience, which has driven many to despair."

Volume III is a minute and exhaustive discussion of Indulgences, that abominable system, whose execrable, shameless traffic in sin enabled Luther to arouse Europe from its spiritual stupor, and to open men's eyes to the awful depths of degradation which the Christian Church had reached under the rule of the popes.

As faithful and intelligible witnesses to truths of history, the knowledge of which is needed as badly to-day as at any time since the Reformation, these volumes will, it is to be hoped, have the wide reading which their theme and its treatment so fully deserve. E. J. W.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

After Fifty Years, or an Historical Sketch of the Guntur Mission of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of the General Synod in the United States of America. By Rev. L. B. Wolf, A. M., Principal of the Arthur G. Watts Memorial College, and Fellow of the Madras University. With an Introduction by Rev. E. J. Wolf, D. D., Professor of Church History and N. T. Exegesis, Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa. pp. 320. Price, $1.50.

The story of the General Synod's mission in India is here told by one who knows it "like a book." He has been on the ground for more than ten years, and his official relation to the mission has given special opportunities for learning its history from the beginning to the present in all its details. He has, too, the qualifications of mind to tell the story in a way that makes it satisfactory to the reader for clearness and interest.

In the treatment of puzzling and vexing methods and problems in the

mission field he is careful and discriminating. Dr. Wolf, in his introduction, well says: "The author shows throughout these pages an admirable capacity for recognizing the extent of serious, inevitable and stubborn obstacles encountered by missions in pagan lands. His zeal for the work has not blinded him to its difficulties. His conscience, too, holds him by a firmer grip than his enthusiasm; and while optimistic in temper and serenely confident of the ultimate victory, he not only gives a complete survey of the field with its multitudinous and complex hindrances, but he also takes pains to describe things as they actually are, rather than as he and his readers would fain have them."

The large space devoted to the personalia of the mission adds much to the interest of the book. The pictures, too, both of the missionaries and mission scenes, are an attractive feature. The fine, well-finished paper is well adapted for these pictures as well as for letter press, every page being a pleasure to the eye.

The wide circulation of this work will give a new impetus to the work it represents. Not that the author makes the book a plea for foreign missions or his own special plea. This he does not do. The plain, straightforward story he tells is a plea in itself and, if read, will awaken a response.

Lutheran Manual and Guide. By Frederick W. Conrad, D. D., LL. D., together with a Biographic Sketch of Luther and His Work by Victor L. Conrad, Ph. D., D. D. pp. 165. Price, 50 cents each, or $4.80 per dozen, postpaid.

This little volume is designed as a manual for the members of the Lutheran Church, and especially as a souvenir from pastors to catechumens at their confirmation. It is admirably adapted to this design, as it tells of the history of the Lutheran Church, her doctrines, worship, polity, distinctive features, etc. It gives also the statistics of membership on both hemispheres, the festivals and scripture lessons of the Church Year, prayers and hymns for family worship, table of Christian duties, and closes with an excellent biographical sketch of Luther and his work. It will undoubtedly prove a useful hand-book to Lutheran young people, and pastors will do well in getting it into their hands. There is a special edition containing a neat certificate of confirmation, specially suitable at this season when so many enter into communicant membership in the churches.

EATON AND MAINS, NEW YORK.

Ulysses S. Grant. Conversations and Letters. By M. J. Cramer, D. D., LL. D., Ex-United States Minister to Denmark and to Switzerland. pp. 207. Price, 90 cents.

The interest in General Grant increases rather than diminishes. His public life, however, has been the part hitherto receiving the most at-

tention with only here and there a side light on his family life and his relations to personal friends. In this book it is the reverse, the side lights being thrown, in the main, only incidentally on his relation to public affairs. We get this view from one of his relatives by marriage, a gentleman who had Grant's confidence and who had frequent correspondence with him from 1863 till after 1880. The reader will get abundant evidence of Grant's fidelity to friends, his plain American tastes, his aversion to pompous display, his attachment to his kindred and especially his love for his own immediate household. Many of his letters refer to his boys while at school, familiarly calling them Fred and Buck. In his position as General of the Army or as President he was still the plain man in his family, the same as any other American of republican principles and training. Dr. Cramer has given us an interesting little book.

Beyond the Horizon, or Bright Side Chapters on the Future Life. By Henry D. Kimball, D. D. pp. 250. Price, $1.00.

However much it may sometimes seem otherwise, few men are so absorbed in the questions and affairs of the present life that no thought of the future—serious thought too—ever occupies their minds. At such times, at least, even if in the push and worry of life's struggle the subject finds no place, they will readily take up such a book as this and see what another may say on such points as these: Whether there is conscious existence after death, the question of an intermediate state, the doctrine of the resurrection, what is the manner of the body, the nature of the judgment, where and what heaven is, and whether a man will recognize his friends and loved ones there. These questions will be found discussed here, and the believer in the Christian Revelation will find much light and comfort. The chief merit of the treatment in these pages is the constant appeal to the Scriptures in support of the arguments.

The Celestial Summons. By Rev. Angelo Canoll. Edited by Homer Eaton, D. D. pp. 280.

Mr. Canoll was a man of strong convictions and intense purpose. This is manifest in every one of the sermons within the lids of this book. There is, too, an impetuosity of expression that is exhilarating to the reader and that gives evidence of the powers of oratory for which he is credited in the introduction. The book takes its title from the subject of the first sermon, but every one of the twelve will be felt by the reader as a "celestial summons" to the acceptance of divine truth. In the eighth, entitled "The Great Plaudit," the advocates of a second probation will not find much comfort. If we were to make any distinctions in the merits of these sermons we should be inclined to decide in favor of this and the second, entitled "Christ the World-Leader." Not one of them gives an uncertain sound on the great truths of Evangelical Christianity.

ANTIQUARIAN BOOK COMPANY, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The Archko Volume, or The Archæological Writings of the Sanhedrim and Talmuds of the Jews. Translated by Drs. McIntosh and Twyman, of the Antiquarian Lodge, Genoa, Italy. pp. 248.

The contents of this book are claimed to be the official documents of the Jewish Sanhedrim in the days of Christ, translated from manuscripts in Constantinople and "records of the senatorial docket taken from the Vatican at Rome." The story of the acquisition of the documents is told by Mr. W. D. Mahan, of DeWitt, Carroll Co , Mo. He takes special pains to satisfy the reader of the genuineness of the documents and that everything was done with painstaking care and with a caution that ought to have been a sure guard against deception.

After a short sketch of the Talmuds, he gives Constantine's letter in regard to having fifty copies of the Scriptures written and bound; then, in order, Jonathan's interview with the Bethlehem Shepherds; Gamaliel's interview with Joseph and Mary; report of Caiaphas to the Sanhedrim concerning the execution of Jesus and also of his resurrection; Pilate's report to Cæsar of the arrest, trial and crucifixion of Jesus; Herod Antipater's defense before the Roman Senate in regard to his conduct at Bethlehem; Herod Antipas' defense before the same body in regard to the execution of John the Baptist; and Hillel's letters to the Jews regarding God's providence.

The letters of Herod Antipater, Herod Antipas and Pontius Pilate have the signatures of the writers at the close just like a letter of today. We are under a very decided impression that a Roman, in writing a letter, put his name at the beginning. Pilate not only has his name at the end of his letter, but he follows the modern fashion still further by closing it thus: "I am your most obedient servant." In all our reading of letters by Romans we have never happened upon anything like this. Perhaps Mr. Mahan can explain why the Herods and Pilate varied from the usual form.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT AND COMPANY, PHILADELPHIA.

Historical Tales, Roman and Greek. By Charles Morris. pp. 340 and 366.

These are two separate volumes in an excellent series coming from the press of the above publishers. They do not contain new tales but they present the legends of history in new and fascinating dress, and we find them invested with a new interest. A certain quality of romance is added to many tales romantic in themselves, and they are splendidly adapted to the youth of this age. They will be learning history and mythology while they fancy they are only being entertained. The illustrations in these two volumes form a conspicuous and valuable part of them. They are finely finished photographs of classic buildings and historical scenes, and they are so distinct and perfect in every de-

tail as to make them an important feature. Each volume contains twelve of these attractive illustrations. They include the Ruins of the Parthenon; Remains of the Temple of Minerva; Ruins of Palmyra; Forum of Rome; Ruins of Roman Aqueducts; Baths of Caracalla; A Roman Chariot Race and Ruins of Pompeii.

FUNK AND WAGNALLS, NEW YORK.

English Synonyms and Antonyms. By James C. Fernald.

This is one of the most welcome books that has come to our table. It meets in a satisfactory manner a decided want. The only books of a similar character that are available are greatly inferior to this. The author claims that the best defense against the flood of so called literature which is being sent forth by the press, but which "does not bear the stamp of immortality," is the teaching of pure English speech, and that may be greatly promoted by a careful study of this book. Recognizing the poverty of language which many persons possess and the frequency with which one word is often employed to express various shades of meaning, the writer claims that special instruction in synonyms is necessary, and that in the first place such persons need to be reminded that there are synonyms. It would be a surprise to many to know that there are fifteen synonyms for benevolence, twenty-one for beginning and thirty-seven for pure. But the importance of showing that synonyms are not identical has not been ignored, and just here is where the special merit of this work is to be found. The author first gives the synonym of a word and then, in a paragraph of some length, very clearly gives the various shades of thought of all the various synonyms. This is a unique feature of this work and its most valuable one. He also shows how valuable are antonyms in supplying definition by contrast or by negation "an effective method of defining being to tell what a thing is not." The antonyms are given at the foot of the paragraph which gives the shades of thought of the various synonyms of each word, as is also the correct use of prepositions likely to be employed with the word considered. The book contains seven thousand synonyms and three thousand seven hundred antonyms and the only fault we have to find with it is that it is not more full. Finding the synonyms given so satisfactorily it is a disappointment not to find in it the synonyms of every word we may look for. It is most admirably adapted to the class-room and a set of questions and examples are appended for such use. When we find how difficult it is to answer these questions, and to fill the blanks in the examples, we realize with how much profit the work may be used as a text-book. Surely it should at least find a place on the table of every genuine student.

T. Y. CROWELL AND CO., BOSTON.

The Story of a Busy Life. Edited by J. R. Miller, D. D. pp. 275.

The life of which Rev. Dr. Miller writes was that of Mrs. George A.

Paull. She was known particularly to the readers of religious literature, as she contributed during her short life much to the religious periodicals and also wrote several books of a similar character, and she was known, too, to many little children all over the land through her charming Prince Dimple books. Her character was one of unusual beauty. Possessed of a fine mind—with talent that might have won her distinction had she yielded to the temptation to make it serve only her ambition—great physical beauty, a sympathy with the great heart of mankind in all its forms of suffering, willing to sacrifice self if only she could bring relief to others, and with a life entirely consecrated to her Master, she was indeed a fit example for many others; and so her friend, Dr. Miller, who knew her well and who had watched the development of her Christian character, finds pleasure in telling the story of her life—not a great life—not one that ever made a great stir, but one that has accomplished its mission and has left its impress on the lives of others. It is a helpful book and one that is written so pleasantly, so sympathetically that it holds the reader's attention very closely. And it must accomplish much good. Few can read the well-told story of the life of Mrs. Paull without a sense of their own unworthiness, without being stimulated to a higher and holier life. We learned to know her through the columns of the *New York Evangelist* and we took great pleasure in calling attention to her books as they came from the press. We trust that the story of her life will fulfill the purpose for which it was undertaken, as we bid it God-speed.

THOMAS Y. CROWELL AND COMPANY, 46 EAST 14TH ST., NEW YORK.

Rustic Life in France. By André Theuriet. Translated from the French by Helen B. Dole.

Industrial enterprise in France, as in America, is taking hold of meadows, fields and woods. Improved machinery is doing away with the elementary implements used in farming, and the writer, observing this, desired to preserve to posterity such descriptions of the life and surroundings of the peasantry as would give them such correct ideas of rural life as future observations and experience could not give. He has an artist's love of nature. He loves all and recognizes all that is picturesque in it and, whether it is the homely duty of potato raising, sheep washing or spinning, it has an artistic quality which he discovers and describes as only one with the soul of an artist may do. It has been his effort faithfully to collect relics of customs and landscapes likely to disappear and thus to preserve them to posterity. The description of rustic life in France begins with the peasant in the osier or walnut cradle and carries him through days of toil and hardships, but of such peaceful repose as the ambitious dweller in large cities may not know, while he ploughs and sows and reaps; prunes his vines, fells his trees, makes his wine, raises his potatoes, and attends to all the homely duties of farm life down to his pine coffin and his last rest. The home

and school life are faithfully described, the duties of the wife, mother and children are enumerated, and the relations and responsibilities of life are carefully drawn. It is such a book as one not only enjoys but reaps profit from and wishes always to keep. But the writer must share the encomiums which the book will receive with the artist, for he has done much to lend fascination to its pages. Léon Lhermitte is the artist who has furnished many very choice illustrations of peasant life in France, and they add greatly to the charms of the book which is most handsomely bound and dedicated to Baroness Nathaniel de Rothschild.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND CO., BOSTON.

Authors and Friends. By Annie Fields. pp. 355.

It is unusual that one should know personally, almost familiarly, so many celebrated writers as this author does, and be able to write of them from personal experience as she is able to do. But she was fortunately situated in her husband's prominent connection for years with a great publishing house and so gives us new glimpses into the lives of many favorites, including Emerson, Holmes, Mrs. Stowe, Celia Thaxter, Whittier, Longfellow, Tennyson and Lady Tennyson. Far more welcome than the cold estimate of the critic are these reminiscences of friendships with great men and women and the testimony to their ability and worth, for Mrs. Fields has seemed to see only that which was pleasing and, of course, those of whom she here writes possessed many charms. We learn to love them more than ever as she tells of their fascinating qualities. She and Mr. Fields traveled in Southern Italy with Mrs. Stowe, and she has many things to tell of that journey during which "Agnes of Sorrento" was conceived. The story of Mrs. Stowe's life is perfectly familiar to her and she imparts to the story of it a new fascination. But equally so are the lives of the other characters of whom she has chosen to write. Many incidents hitherto unknown, many traits of character, many letters are here given for the first time, and somehow we feel that we have had such a glimpse as we have never known into the very heart and sympathy of those we have long loved. Every page is interesting, not only because it holds new facts into the possession of which we are glad to come, but because the writer has such a pleasing style that she seems almost to be talking to her reader. Surely no one has written more delightfully, more appreciatively of Celia Thaxter than has Mrs. Fields in her sketch. It is a tribute truly poetical and betrays her own love of "Nature" as do others of these sketches. To have so well known great men and women such as these was surely an unusual privilege and to have written of them with such warm appreciation and yet such analytical power, to have told of them just what all their readers cared to know, to have shared all those precious memories with other friends and admirers, was surely a generous thought.

Talks about Autographs. By George Birkbeck Hill.

Not only the autograph collector but all those who find any interest in autographs will enjoy this book. And to those will be added many who are anxious to find out all they can of the peculiar traits of great men and also the various means used in obtaining autographs. Mr. Hill has gathered into this volume a great number of facts concerning men and letters hitherto unpublished. Many of these are of men well known and often written about, but many are names not familiar to the great reading public, proof of the fact that he has been an unusually successful collector of autographs, as he writes mainly of those from whom he had obtained those favors. Among his collection he has the autographs of but two Americans, one is that of George Washington and the other that of William Lloyd Garrison, but we find those that others have given very attractive and particularly the *fac simile* ones. Mr. Hill has various ways to suggest in order to approach without offense the noted individual whose hand writing is prized. He suggests enclosing a five-dollar bill or a barrel of oysters—anything substantial which might naturally expect an acknowledgment," He trusts that, when the reader lays aside his book, he will say with Dr. Johnson, "Sir, we had a good talk," and we should judge that his hopes will be realized. There are some fine illustrations, and the binding and general character of the book are superb and in every way artistic.

PERIODICALS.

The *Atlantic Monthly* for April is excellent. Among its contents are, Dominant Forces in Western Life, The Nominating System, Higginson's Cheerful Yesterdays—sixth paper, A Century of Anglo-Saxon Expansion, Bryant's Permanent Contribution to Literature. The four chapters, XV–XVIII, of The Story of an Untold Love, will make the reader impatient for the May number. The ten pages devoted to Comment on Recent Books in American History are an example of expert book-reviewing.

The April *Century* is appropriately called the "Grant Memorial Number." The frontispiece is "The Tomb of General Grant" followed by a paper on the same by Horace Porter; Sherman's Opinion of Grant, written fourteen years after the war, is given; a picture of Grant and friends at the Bonanza Mines is furnished by Col. Fred Grant; Horace Porter has another interesting installment of his Campaigning with General Grant; a facsimile of Grant's most famous despatch is given; there is a paper on Grant and Buckner by John R. Procter; and also A Veto by Grant.

St. Nicholas is the model magazine for young people. The April issue is one of its best numbers—bright, cheery, finely illustrated, full of interest, instructive—first-class all through. "Seeing and Believing" is given top place on the cover and deserves it. The boys and girls will be interested in Dr. Wilson's illustrated paper on the subject.

Table Talk is what every good housewife wants. The hints furnished by the *menus* are worth many times the cost of the magazine in the worry they save in planning for the table. All the pages of *Table Talk* are well filled with what will help and interest the people who love home life.

„BETTER THAN EVER"

The 1897 BEN-HUR BICYCLES embody more new and genuine improvements in construction than any other bicycles now before the public. Never before have such excellent values been offered for the money. Our new line, consisting of eight superb models at $60, $75 and $125 for single machines, and $150 for tandems, with the various options offered, is such that the most exacting purchaser can be entirely suited.

CENTRAL CYCLE MFG. CO.,

72 GARDEN STREET. INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

OUR FINE POSTER CATALOGUE MAILED FOR TWO 2-CENT STAMPS.

THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF

THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

JULY, 1897.

ARTICLE I.

MELANCHTHON AND THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

By Prof. J. W. Richard, D. D.

THE PREPARATION.

January 21st, 1530, Charles V., issued a mandate from Bologna announcing a Diet of the Empire at Augsburg to be opened, April 8th. One of the objects of the Diet was "to consult and decide about the disturbances and dissensions in the Holy Faith and the Christian Religion."* He promised that all opinions should be "heard, understood and considered in love and kindness, so that what is not right in both parties may be abolished, and all may live together in one Church."

The Imperial Rescript reached Torgau, March 11th. The Elector, following the advice of his counsellors, at once began to make the necessary preparation for the journey to Augsburg. Luther, Jonas, Melanchthon, Musa of Jena, Agricola and Spalatin, were to attend "as learned counsellors." The two first named were to remain at Nurenberg and await further decision. Agricola was to serve as preacher, and "Master Spalatin was to be used for faith and other things in connection with the other counsellors."†

*Förstemann. *Urkundenbuch*, I., 2. †Förstemann, I., 14.

Chancellor Brück suggested that their party should prepare a written statement, amply fortified by Scripture, and have it in readiness, so that in case the preachers should not be permitted to participate in the Diet, such statement could be presented, and might serve to facilitate business and to remove misunderstandings.* The Elector, acting, it is believed, on this suggestion, March 14th, informed his Wittenberg theologians of the proposed Diet, and expressed the conviction that "a great and unavoidable need will require that we have all the articles about which there has been controversy, both in faith and in other external church usages and ceremonies in such a form, that before the opening of the Diet, it may be fully decided, whether, or in what manner, or how far, we who have received the pure doctrine, may and can enter upon negotiation before God and with a good conscience. As none understand such things better than yourselves it is our gracious desire, that, laying aside all other business, you address yourselves to these things, and have them ready by next Sunday (March 20th) and come to Torgau with them on that day."†

This letter reached Wittenberg the same day on which it was written. Jonas was absent on the Visitation, but was immediately recalled by Luther, who writes: "We are to finish before next Sunday what things are necessary for the Diet, April 8th."‡ He does not say one word about composing articles. Whether articles were composed, and if so, what they were, or where they are, cannot now be determined with certainty. We do know that the theologians did not go to Torgau, March 20th. If they disobeyed the Electoral command in one thing, they may have disobeyed it in another. March 21st the Elector writes them another letter, urging them to come to Torgau, and to bring their books with them, as other things awaited their attention.§ Melanchthon was in Torgau, March 27th. But Luther probably did not go.‖ It is not a matter of contemporaneous record that Melanchthon took any "articles of faith and ceremonies" with him to Torgau. The Electoral Rescript had

*Förstemann, I., 39. †Ibid. 42–4.
‡DeWette, III., 564. §C. R. II., 33. ‖Köstlin, II., 651.

not commanded that articles be *written*, though that is the implication. So unsatisfactory is our information on this point that the ripest scholarship can only affirm with Prof. Kolde: "A document with the title 'Torgau Articles,' or which on the basis of contemporaneous reports can with full certainty be shown to have been delivered at that time, we do not possess. Hence the most diverse conjectures have been promulgated. Yet the researches of Engelhardt (*Zh.-Th.;* 1865, 515, ff.) and especially of Brieger (*Kirchengeschichte Studien*, 1888, p. 268, ff.), have rendered it highly probable that the much sought 'Torgau Articles' are identical with an opinion (Gutachten) (Förstemann's *Urkundenbuch*, I., 68–84) which as an important document was taken by the Elector to Augsburg, and manifestly became the foundation of the subsequent Confession. And this is not contradicted by the fact that the writing in question, contrary to the Elector's order to report 'on faith and ceremonies,' treats only of the latter. For remembering that according to the admission of their opponents even, the doctrine preached in the Electoral lands, 'is Christian and comforting, and right in itself,' and that the Schism had arisen chiefly on account of certain abuses,' which had been introduced by the doctrines and statutes of men, and because they could not concede that their doctrine is new, or that it differs from the genuine true evangelical doctrine of the Church, the authors, according to their own declaration, limited themselves to the reasons for the abolition of those abuses. They also promised, in case there was a desire to know what else was preached in the Electorate, 'to present articles in which the entire teaching was embraced in an orderly way;' in general, also, a further elaboration of the original Gutachten, which had been hastily composed and was intended to be presented to the Diet by the Elector alone, was kept in view from the beginning, and was already resolved upon."*

If the essay A, given in Förstemann's *Urkundenbuch*, I., 68–84, and in Jacobs' "*Book of Concord*," II., 75–86, be, or be a part of, "the Torgau Articles," then it is morally, if not demon-

*Prof. Kolde in Real-Encyc. (1896) II., 243. See also his Augsburg. Konf. p. 2.

strably certain, that no doctrinal articles were presented to the Elector at Torgau, for the reasons given in that essay, and summarized by Kolde. It is inconceivable that the Wittenberg theologians should say in that essay: "The things thus far stated are concerning external ordinances and customs," and promise "to give articles on the entire Christian doctrine in answer to a desire, should it be made," and then at the same time *present* articles of doctrine. Such action would involve a contradiction. Yet the question cannot be decided absolutely.* Nearly all of the older writers identified the Schwabach Articles either unchanged or slightly modified with the Torgau Articles. This theory was called in question by Bertram in 1767, and was attacked with very acute arguments by Weber in 1783. Many recent writers, as Köllner, Engelhardt, Knaake, Plitt and Gumlich, include the Schwabach Articles with others in the common designation: "Torgau Articles." But this latter supposition can have little or no practical bearing on the present discussion, since it is freely acknowledged that these Schwabach Articles form the *basis* of a *part* of the so-called doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession.

In 1833 Förstemann published certain essays discovered by him in Weimar. These he unhesitatingly proclaimed to be the long sought "Torgau Articles," and to make his theory the more plausible he supported it by the theory that the "Preface" (exordium) spoken of by Melanchthon in his letter to Luther, May 4th† is the doctrinal part of the Confession. For a time Förstemann was followed unquestioningly by some theologians in Germany and by some in America. But Förstemann's procedure was arbitrary and uncritical. He arranged the essays in an order, and distinguished them by the letters of the alphabet from A to F.‡ But the real order of these essays, which exist only in copy, that is, not in the hand of their author or authors, is D A B E F C. Förstemann made little or no critical comparison of these essays with other documents of the Reforma-

*See Brieger in *Kirchengeschicht. Studien*, p. 311.

†C. R. II., 39.

‡*Urkundenbuch*, I., 68–108. In English by Jacobs, II., 75–98.

tion era whose history is known, or can be pretty accurately traced. Hence careful criticism has greatly modified his theories, for rational conclusions they cannot be called. No competent scholar would now affirm so confidently as he did, that we really have the "Torgau Articles," much less that Melanchthon's "Preface" is the first or doctrinal part of the Confession. Long ago Bretschneider and Plitt gave ample reasons for rejecting this theory about the "Preface."*

It is true that essay A does say that the defense of the Elector may be introduced by "a long and rhetorical preface," but it is impossible to believe that Melanchthon would call the doctrinal articles of the Confession "a long and rhetorical preface," and then write to Luther that he had made that preface "somewhat more rhetorical." Besides, as will hereafter be shown, the entire weight of argument and of *testimony* is against the supposition that the "Apology" in its first form, or up to May 4th, had articles of faith. And as to the "Preface" we probably have that in the *Corpus Reformatorum* IV., 999 et seq.† At least we have a document there both long enough and rhetorical enough to meet the demands of this "Preface." Besides, this document is apologetic in character, and its title shows that it was intended for delivery to the Emperor. When circumstances required a "Confession" rather than an "Apology," and when it became more and more evident that this Confession was also a *state-paper*, a different kind of preface would be required, and a different kind we have in the Preface which introduces the Confession.

And in regard to the essays of which Förstemann declares: "That incontestably they were written upon order of the Elector by the Wittenberg Theologians, and that they are to be considered as without doubt the foundation of the second part of the Augsburg Confession," the most competent and conservative scholarship unqualifiedly excludes F D B and C from all claim of connection with the "Torgau Articles." In this there is substantial agreement between Bretschneider, Plitt, Engelhardt,

*C. R. IV. 999 et seq., *Einleitung* I., 523.

†Also in Förstemann, I., 63–66.

Knaake, Brieger and Kolde, all of whom were or are specialists in this line of historical research.* In the case of B D and F the proof is positive. B does undoubtedly form the first draft of Article 20 of the Confession: Of Faith and Good Works, and was composed by Melanchthon about June 3rd.† D was sent from Coburg to Augsburg during the Diet, probably very late in July, and consequently had nothing to do with the composition of the Confession.† Bretschneider, Engelhardt, and Brieger give unanswerable reasons for excluding F from the "Torgau Articles," and from participation in the composition of the Confession. Brieger says: "F had nothing to do with the Augustana." Knaake, whose pamphlet of eighty pages was written expressly to exhibit Luther's "Part in the Augsburg Confession," says: "No traces of this essay (F) are met with in the Augsburg Confession." Equally emphatic is Engelhardt.‡ And Kolde excludes all from consideration except A, which he has placed in his "Die Augsburgische Konfession," as the "Torgau Articles."

Neither Bretschneider, nor Engelhardt nor Plitt nor Brieger regard C, which consists of three parts—Of the power of the Keys, Of Excommunication, Of Degrees of Consanguinity—as belonging to the "Torgau Articles." According to Bretschneider the first part was composed at Augsburg, and as the first draft of Article 28, which Melanchthon was writing, May 22nd: "Now I am treating of the power of the Keys." (C. R. II., 60). Certainly Melanchthon's words do plainly intimate that he is working on a *new* article. Brieger says: "Nothing indicates that this essay was presented in Torgau." Engelhardt

*See C. R. IV., 973–4. *Einleitung* I., 320; Niedner's *Zeitschrift* (1865) p. 550 et seq., Knaake's *Luther's Antheil; Real Encyc.* II., 243; *Kircheng. Stud.* 268 et seq. Knaake is editor of the new imperial edition of Luther's Works. Brieger is Prof. of History and Symbolics in Leipzig; Kolde, of same branches in Erlangen.

†See C. R. IV., 1005; Niedner's *Zeitschrift* (1865) p. 564; *K. Studien* p. 283–5.

‡See K. Studien, 283; *Luther's Antheil in der Augsb. Conf.*, 21. Niedner's *Zeitschrift*, 554 et seq.

agrees with Bretschneider, while Plitt and Kolde join in the exclusion of C from the number of the "Torgau Articles."*

Brieger closes his learned and acute investigation of the subject of these four essays with the following words: "The foregoing discussion ought to be sufficient to banish documents F D B C from all scientific treatment of the Torgau Articles."† This result in its essential features had already been reached by Bretschneider, Engelhardt and Plitt, and has been accepted without qualification by Kolde, as already stated in other words. All this stands over against the hasty and uncritical generalization of Förstemann. He who would read all the facts and arguments should examine the references placed in our margin.

"The two longest essays, A and E, remain, as the only parts of Förstemann's discovery which can enter into the question, yet only in such a way that it can at once be shown that one of those two essays does not belong here. But in so far as Förstemann has not been blindly followed, there have been different opinions in regard to A and E. Bretschneider regards A as the first draft of the Confession, written by Melanchthon at Coburg. He looks upon E as written by Melanchthon at Torgau and only imperfectly (9 instead of 17) transmitted to us as the Torgau Articles. Plitt on the whole agrees with him. He thinks it was prepared at Wittenberg by Melanchthon. With Bretschneider he regards A as the first draft of the 'Apology.' Virck has recently declared emphatically that in E we have the desiderated articles. This he has sought to establish by the exhibition of a few almost word-for-word agreements."‡

Calinich thinks that A is only an elaboration of E; that E was Melanchthon's first work, which after consultation was revised by the aid of notes and suggestions from the other theologians.§ There is indeed resemblance in the subjects and in the method of treatment. But if E be the "Torgau Articles,"

*See C. R. IV., Niedner, *Zeitschrift* (1865), 562–4 *K. Studien*, 286–7.

†*K. Studien*, p. 289.

‡Brieger in *K. Studien*, 289. See Plitt's *Einleitung*, I., 321–4. *Zeitschrift für K G.*, IX., 70–72.

§Luther und *die Augs. Conf.* p. 29.

then indeed was Melanchthon furnished with a very small *basis* on which to build the second part of the Augsburg Confession, since this essay consists of only about twelve hundred words, and these were written by Melanchthon himself. This would leave to him the indisputable right to be called the *author* of the second part of the Augsburg Confession.

But Engelhardt and Brieger, after the most careful comparison of E with A and with the Augustana, have reached the two-fold conclusion: "(1) *That* E *and* A *are independent of each other, and stand in no sort of relation, and* (2) *that* E *and the Augustana have nothing to do with each other, that at all events* E *did not form the foundation for the Confession.*"*

Only A is left. This essay consists of an Introduction, and of the following articles: Of the Doctrines and Ordinances of Men; Of the Marriage of Priests; Of Both Forms; Of the Mass; Of Confession; Of Jurisdiction; Of Ordination; Of Vows; Of the Worship of Saints; Of German Singing. The introduction is apologetic in character. Its aim is to vindicate "his Electoral Grace" against the charge of "dispensing with all divine service, and of introducing a heathenish dissolute mode of life and insubordination from which the destruction of all Christendom results." It declares that his Electoral Grace has always been inclined to peace and has helped to maintain peace. It then says: "To this effect it is well to place first a long and rhetorical preface." It says further that "his Electoral Grace" is making provision for the preaching of the Gospel, and that "every one even among the adversaries, must acknowledge that this doctrine, which is taught and written and treated, is Christian and comforting;" and finally: "The dissension now is especially concerning some abuses, which have been introduced by human doctrine and statutes, of which we will report in order, and indicate for what reason my lord is induced to cause certain abuses to be abated."

Several things are noteworthy in this Introduction:

(1.) It uses throughout the first person singular, as "my lord," not *our lord*, when speaking of the Elector. This shows

**K. Studien*, 291; Niedner's *Zeitschrift*, 561.

that the essay is the production of *one* man, not the joint composition of several.

(2.) It calls the adversaries themselves to witness to the purity of the doctrine taught in the Electoral lands.

(3.) It declares that the dissension has arisen principally on account of abuses.

(4.) It shows that the essay was written for the Elector alone, and consequently that it is Saxon in origin, and was intended to vindicate the *Elector* before the Diet.

If we turn to the articles we find that not one of them discusses a *doctrine*, but all treat of "human ordinances which cannot be observed without sin." The titles borne by these articles are in some instances identical, and in others nearly identical, with the titles which since its delivery has been given to several articles of the Confession, as the most appropriate designation for their contents. This is an accidental, though a very remarkable coincidence. If we examine the matter of the two sets of articles, we will find that the first part of Article 21 of the Confession, has its prototype at least in the article, Of the Invocation of Saints, in the essay. The same may be said of Article 22 in its correspondence with the article, Of Both Forms, in the essay, and of Article 23 as compared with the article of corresponding title in the essay, except that article 23 is expanded out of all proportion to the size of its supposed prototype. There is resemblance also in article 24 to the article, Of the Mass, in the essay, though by no means is there identity in subject matter, nor in the manner of treatment. The agreement between article 25, Of Confession, in the Augustana, and the article of the same name in the essay, is so striking as to make it almost certain that the latter was the antecedent or first draft of the former. Article 26 of the Confession, Of the Distinction of Meats, has no antecedent in title in the essay. It contains a few forms of statement that may be traced to the first article in the essay. There is no necessary relation between the two articles. In article 27 in the Confession, Of Monastic Vows, there are *points* of agreement with the article of the same name in the

essay, but the former contains four times as much matter as the latter. Article 28, Of the Power of the Bishops, is the longest in the Confession. It covers six pages in the New Market edition of the Book of Concord, and contains about 2700 words, as over against the article of similar name in the essay, which contains only 425 words. Brieger says that article 28 contains not a trace from A. Engelhardt says that only the fundamental thought is the same, but that the entire treatment is different.* In every proper sense of the word it is an independent article, and there is absolutely nothing to overthrow the supposition that Melanchthon was writing it for the first time, May 22nd.

Brieger sums up his exhaustive discussion with these words: "As a result of our comparison we may set it down that A *in fact has served as preparatory work for the Augustana.* The manner in which it is employed in Article 25, and in individual expressions of 23 and 24 and elsewhere, leaves no doubt of a perfectly demonstrable relationship, so that even in those articles in which we are not led necessarily to employ A, this essay has as a matter of fact furnished the basis for the further elaboration." Bretschneider, Plitt and Virch agree with this conclusion, though they think A was composed at Coburg. It makes but little difference as to the time and place of the origin of A. If it did not arise at Wittenberg, March 14th to 27th, then we must either fall back upon E as the "preparatory work" or deny that we have any "Torgau Articles."

But whether A arose at Wittenberg or at Coburg, it makes it perfectly clear that it was not the original intention to exhibit doctrinal articles before the Diet. Not only does A declare in the Introduction that the adversaries confess that the doctrines preached in the Electoral lands is Christian and comforting and without error, but it expressly promises: "If in addition there should be a desire to know what else my lord causes to be preached, articles may be given in answer, wherein the entire Christian doctrine is set forth in order, that it may be seen that my lord has allowed no heretical doctrine, but has had the Holy Gospel of our Lord Christ preached in the purest way, for even

**K. Studien*, 304.

many of the adversaries must acknowledge that they have been better instructed, concerning many sublime and important subjects, by this doctrine which is preached in my lord's lands, than they were previously taught by the sententiaries and summists."* This extract from the closing paragraph of A, taken in connection with the Introduction, shows beyond question that at the time A was written, it was the intention of the Saxon theologians, or at least of the author of this essay, to confine the defense of "his Electoral Grace" to matters pertaining to ceremonies, and not to touch articles of faith, unless such should be demanded. And this agrees perfectly with the fact that to the very last Melanchthon insisted that there was no dispute in doctrines; and even in the Epilogue-Prologue of the Confession itself he declared that no doctrines were taught which are discrepant with the Scriptures, or with the Catholic Church, or with the Romish Church. And besides this, there is no documentary evidence that the "Apology" as Melanchthon had written it at Coburg, and as he reported of it to Luther, May 4th, contained doctrinal articles, that is, that it was not confined to the treatment of ceremonies, together with "a long and rhetorical preface."

But the question arises, Who was the author of A? Bretschneider, Zöckler, Calinich, Plitt, Knaake, Virck, Brieger and Loofs unite in excluding Luther. Brieger says: "Luther is excluded by reason of the manner in which he is here spoken of."† He alludes to the passage under Of Ordination: "It is to be apprehended that not many Dr. Martins will come after this time, who would control these important matters with such grace, and would avoid false doctrine and war."‡ Knaake declares that Luther's part in the preparation for the Augsburg Confession must be confined to the Marburg and the Schwabach Articles.§ The authorities given above unite in the supposition

**Urkundenbuch*, I., 83; Jacobs, II., 85–6.

†*K. Studien.*

‡Jacobs, II., 83.

§*Luther's Antheil*, 20, 25. In the *Conservative Reformation*, p. 219, Dr. Krauth says: "March 20. These XVII. Articles of Luther (the Schwabach Articles) revised were sent to Torgau, and were long called

that Melanchthon is the author of A, that is, of "the *Torgau Articles proper*," except Loofs, who simply stops with the exclusion of Luther. Kolde, a most thorough and learned investigator shows plainly that he stands on the same side.

Such are the conclusions reached by the most eminent Lutheran scholars in the last thirty or forty years. The investigation has been conducted wholly in the interest of historical science. Reasons are given for every opinion, and the authority for every fact. There seem to be no blank affirmations, no strained interpretations, no forced translations. The documents themselves have been allowed to speak. In regard to the final question: Have we "*Torgau Articles proper*"? no absolute certainty has been reached, and hence no authoritative pronunciamento has been made, but it is regarded as *highly probable* that a certain document bearing the title: "Judgment (Bedenken) of

the Torgau Articles though they are in fact the revised Articles of Schwabach. These Articles are mainly doctrinal." The German scholars with all their research have found no contemporaneous documentary authority witnessing to the sending of "these XVII. Articles" to Torgau, revised or unrevised, on the 20th of March or at any other time. The German scholars deny that any such documentary authority exists. Dr. Krauth gave none. If any reader of this knows of such he will confer a great favor by naming it to the writer. Is not such a statement as Dr. Krauth makes at once confuted by the well-known fact that March 21st the Elector writes in impatience, and insists that his theologians shall hasten to Torgau?

Dr. Krauth goes on to say: "March 20. In addition to these, a special writing, of which Luther was the chief author, in conjunction with Melanchthon, Jonas, and Bugenhagen, was prepared by direction of the Elector, and sent to Torgau. These Articles are on the Abuses, and are the *Torgau Articles proper*."

Again: Where is the documentary authority for the statement that "the *Torgau Articles proper*" were sent to Torgau March 20th or at any other time? German scholars declare there is none. Where is the like authority for the statement that Luther was the chief author of this "special writing" known as "the *Torgau Articles proper*"? German scholars again declare there is no such authority, and they unite in excluding Luther from such authorship, since the question of "the Torgau Articles proper" is narrowed down to a choice between A and E, with the balance greatly in favor of A.

Dr. Krauth says of the Schwabach and "the *Torgau Articles proper*": "Both these are mainly from the hand of Luther." In regard to the latter we ask for the proof, for none is offered.

the learned at Wittenberg on Ceremonies and what is therewith Connected, to be Presented to the Emperor,"* which we know was taken to Augsburg, is identical with the "Torgau Articles," is our A. If this be so then we know what is the *basis* of a part of the second part of the Augsburg Confession, and consequently who is best entitled to be considered as the author of that part of the Confession. If E be identical with the Torgau Articles, the question of authorship of the second part of the Confession, is practically unchanged, since this essay too is regarded by the highest and most learned authorities not as Luther's, but as Melanchthon's. This essay then of about 1300 words has been expanded into an essay, including Article 21, of nearly ten times so many words, to say nothing about the omissions, the introduction of new thoughts, the changes of order, the refinement of the style, and other qualities, which are peculiar to the Augsburg Confession as such.

THE COMPOSITION.

April 3rd Luther, Melanchthon and Jonas left Wittenberg for Torgau. The next day the Elector set out for Augsburg, having in his train besides "the learned counsellors," his son John Frederick, Francis Duke of Lüneburg, Wolfgang Prince of Anhalt, and Albert Count of Mansfield, with seventy noblemen and their escort numbering in all one hundred and sixty persons. Coburg was reached Friday, April 15th. Here the party rested till April 23rd, and here Luther was left, for reasons that need not now be mentioned.† Here, as is supposed, Melanchthon was commissioned to write an "Apology" to be delivered to the Emperor as a vindication of "his Electoral Grace" against the charge of having created or tolerated schism in religion. It is easy to see why this important work was placed in his hands. He was the most accomplished theologian, and the most polished writer among the "learned counsellors." He had written the *Visitation Articles*, and in all probability he was the author of the "Torgau Articles." Just what he wrote at Coburg and

**Urkundenbuch*, 138.

†Kolde in *K. Studien.*

on the way thence to Augsburg, which was entered May 2nd, is not known. May 4th he wrote to Luther: "I have made the preface (exordium) of our Apology somewhat more rhetorical than I had written at Coburg. But in a short time I will bring, or if the Prince will not permit it, I will send."* There is nothing in this letter which says what Melanchthon will bring or send. But the same day he wrote to Veit Dietrick, who was with Luther at Coburg: "In a short time I will run over to you in order to bring to the Doctor for examination the Apology which is to be presented to the Emperor."† What this *preface* was, of which we have already heard, is only a matter of conjecture.

Nor have we any means of knowing what the "Apology" was at that time. We may suppose that it had undergone considerable change between April 23rd and May 4th, otherwise Melancthon would not have desired to submit it to Luther for examination. It probably consisted now of the "Torgau Articles" expanded pretty much into the shape of the second part of the Confession. There is at least nothing to indicate that at this time it contained articles of faith. Indeed the supposition of articles of faith at this time is excluded by what is said so emphatically in the "Torgau Articles" (A), namely, that there is no dissension about articles of faith, and that articles of faith would be presented, if desired. We know that it was the studied policy of Melanchthon to insist that in *doctrine* the Saxon churches had not departed from the Catholic Church, and up to this time no desire had been expressed to know "what else my lord causes to be preached."

But a new exigency now arises. Scarcely had the Diet been proclaimed when the dukes of Bavaria instructed the Theological Faculty of Ingoldstadt "to bring together in epitome all the articles which for twelve years had been advanced by Luther, and to show their discrepance from the true Christian faith, and the best method of refuting them."‡ This furnished an occasion

*C. R. II., 40. Ibid. 41.
†C. R. IV., 999.
‡*Real Encyc.* II., 244.

for John Eck to compose a book containing 404 articles extracted from the writings of those who were disturbing the Church. Passages torn from their connection were taken from the writings of Luther, Melanchthon, Carlstadt, Zwingli and others, and placed under appropriate rubrics together with quotations from the writings of Anabaptists like Denk, Hubmeyer and others.* A manuscript copy of this book with a letter well calculated to exasperate, was sent to the Emperor by Eck, who promised to defend its propositions before the Diet. In order the more fully to attain his purpose of placing the Protestants at a disadvantage, he had the book translated into German for the people.† Melanchthon, who came into possession of a copy of this book at Augsburg, could no longer say, as was said in the "Torgau Articles." "Every one, even among the adversaries, must acknowledge that this doctrine, which is taught, and written, and treated, is Christian and comforting, and that in it there is no error." It was now evident that the *doctrines*, the articles of faith, were to be attactked before the Emperor and the Diet. The entire purview was now changed. The "Apology" was not broad enough. It could meet only a part of the enemies' charges. It had become necessary for the Lutherans to purge themselves from the accusation of heresy, and to repudiate the company in which they had been placed. The Apology must include articles of faith, so as to refute the slanders of Eck. Melanchthon had also learned from the official reports of John von Dolzig, whom the Elector had sent forward to negotiate certain matters with the Emperor, that his Majesty would have no time for long discussions about religion.‡ The slanders of Eck and the necessity for brevity furnish the stand-

*The title of Eck's book is: Sub domini Ihesu et Mariae patrocinio. Articulos 404 partim ad disputationes Lipsicam, Baden, and Bernen attinentes, partim vero ex scriptis pacem ecclesiae perturbantium extractos, Coram divo Caesare Carolo V. Ro. Imp. semper Augu. etc. ac proceribus Imperii, Joan. Eckius minimus ecclesiae minister, offert se disputatu—rum, ut in scheda latius ex-plicatur Augustae Vin—delicorum. Die et hora consensu Caesaris posterius publicandis. Kolde's *Augs. Konf.* 4.

†Plitt. *Einleitung* I., 527.

‡*Urkundenbuch*, I., 173, 181.

points from which the Confession must henceforth be viewed. The damnatory clauses, the frequent references to the teaching of the early pure Church, the studied brevity in the first part of the Confession, have their explanation in these changed conditions, for there are no damnatory clauses in the Schwabach Articles, and but few references to the early Church, and there is greater fulness in the treatment of several of the corresponding Schwabach articles. Besides, after May 4th, we hear nothing more of the "long and rhetorical preface." Everything now must be put in the most condensed form consistent with truth and clearness, and with the demands imposed by the allegations of Eck's book. Plitt, Virck, Brieger, Kolde,* and others unite in the view that Melanchthon now resolved to include in the Apology articles of faith. Kolde's own words are:

"Upon learning of this writing, Melanchthon could no longer doubt that the Apology must extend itself over the articles of *faith.* But since the Emperor would have no time to hear long discussions in the defense of the evangelical doctrine against the slanders of Eck, he resolved to admit articles of faith, and to give the whole more the character of a *confession.*"† For this purpose he would naturally fall back upon the Schwabach Articles, which at the convention of Schwabach bore the title: "Articles of the Elector of Saxony concerning Faith," and which, in revised form, had already, the last of April or the first of May, been sent forward and delivered to the Emperor at Innsbruck.‡ Dolzig's first report announcing the delivery of the articles to the Emperor, reached Augsburg, May 7th, and his second, stating that the Emperor would give but little time to the affairs of religion, came May 10th. Evidently between May 4th and May 11th Melanchthon had become acquainted with Eck's book, and had been assured of the need of brevity.

*See *Einleitung*, I., 530; *Zeitschrift für K. G.* IX., 71; *K. Studien*, 227; *Augs. Konf.* 4; *Real-Encyc.* II., 244. Köstlin (*Martin Luther*, II., 209) says: "The new attacks of Eck had now fully determined him (Melanchthon) to admit into it (the Apology) all the chief articles of faith."

†*Real Encyc.*, II., 244. *Luther's Leben*, II., 335.

‡See Brieger in *K. Studien*, p. 212–3, and Hans von Dolzig's reports in *Urkundenbuch*, p. 173, 181.

There could have been no need of acquainting the Emperor with the Elector's articles of faith, but there was the most imperative need of meeting and opposing Eck's slanders. It would require only a very short time for Melanchthon to compose the *first draft* of the *articulos fidei* on the basis of the Schwabach Articles, which he had helped to compose,* as doubtless he had prepared the articles sent already to the Emperor.

May 11th Melanchthon wrote to Luther as follows: "Our Apology is sent to you, though it is more truly a confession. For the Emperor does not have time to hear long discussions. Nevertheless I have said those things which I thought to be either specially profitable or proper. With this design I have brought together about all the articles of faith, because *Eck* has published the most diabolical slanders against us. Against these I wished to oppose a remedy. Do you in accordance with your spirit judge of the whole writing."† It will be observed that Melanchthon still retains the name "Apology," but he regards "confession" as the more appropriate designation. He hints at abbreviation, or at least at brevity. He declares that he has brought together almost all the articles of faith, because (quia) *Eck* has published the most diabolical slanders. The expressed design of bringing together these articles of faith is to oppose a remedy to these slanders; that is, the articles of faith stand in relation to Eck's slanders as effect to cause. This is the natural and necessary interpretation of Melanchthon's language. Moreover, what need could there have been of informing Luther of the bringing together of articles of faith, if it had already been determined from the beginning that such articles should be included, and had been included at Coburg? And this position is fully sustained by Melanchthon's own account of the composition of the Confession, the fullest and most

*Luther distinctly says in his first publication of the Schmalkald articles that he helped to compose such articles. *Erl. Ed.* 24, 337.

†Hoc concilio omnes fere articulos fidei complexus sum, quia *Eckius* edidit διαβολιχωτάτας διαβολὰς contra nos. Adversus has volui remedium opponere. Tu pro tuo spiritu de toto scripto statues. C. R. II., 45.

explicit that ever came from his pen. It is found in the preface to the German edition of his *Corpus Doctrinae*, and was composed September 29th, 1559, or only a few months before he died. After speaking of the calling of the Diet by the Emperor, and of the diversity of views that followed, he says: "Also some papal writers had scattered slanders in the Diet, by which abominable lies were heaped on our churches, as that we had many damnable errors, and, like the Anabaptists, were heretical and seditious. Now an answer had to be made to the Emperor; and for the refutation of the slanders it was resolved that all the articles of Christian doctrine should be brought together in order, so that everyone might know that our churches were unjustly accused by these papal slanders."* There can be no doubt that Melanchthon here alludes to Eck's "most diabolical slanders." He says "that all the articles of Christian doctrine were brought together" for the refutation of these slanders. It is again the relation of cause and effect. It is a new idea born under new circumstances, and is really the beginning of the Augsburg Confession *as such.*

The "Apology," *alias* Confession, in the form and to the extent in which it had now been composed by Melanchthon, was transmitted, May 11th to Luther by the Elector, with the following letter: "After that you and our other learned men at Wittenberg, according to our gracious purpose and desire, had brought into summary statement the articles which are in controversy about religion, we will not conceal from you that now Philip Melanchthon here has further revised them and has brought them into a form which we herewith send you. It is our gracious desire that you should not hesitate further to revise and consider them. And if they please you, or if you think to add or subtract anything, note it on the margin (daneben)†, and

*C. R. IX., 927.

†We have translated daneben "on the margin." In doing this we have followed such men as Weber, Schmidt, Kolde and others, who explain *danaben* in this identical passage of the Elector's letter, by *am Rande*, "on the margin." It is supposed that these German scholars understand their own language, and that they have no interest in perverting it in this passage. Dr. Krauth in the *Conservative Reformation*, p. 224, has trans-

in order that we may be ready at the arrival of his Imperial Majesty, which we expect soon, send back the same, well secured and sealed, immediately by this messenger."*

Luther's answer to this letter is dated May 15th: "I have read over M. Philip's Apology. It pleases me very well, and I know of nothing therein to be improved or changed; nor would it become me, for I cannot move so softly and lightly. Christ our Lord grant that it may bring much and great fruit, as we hope and pray."† Says Plitt: "Luther changed nothing; the 'Apology' pleased him, only the tone, he thought, was too mild."‡

Luther received the Confession in its *first draft*, in what the Germans call "der erste Entwurf," "der fertige Entwurf." We do not really know how *much* of the Confession Luther saw; but we do know that the Confession was very far from being in its final form. For instance, it did not yet contain Article 20, Of Faith and Good Works, which is nearly one-fourth of the so-called doctrinal part. We know further that Luther did not see Article 27 in its present form; and in all probability Article 28 had not then been written; that is, altogether he did not see fully one-third of the Confession in its final form. Melanchthon went on changing from day to day. What changes he made in the main will appear as we proceed.

May 22nd Melanchthon wrote to Luther again: "In the Apology we change many things daily. I have taken out the article *On Vows* (27), because it was too brief, and have supplied

lated it, "at the *same time*." If any reader knows of a reputable German scholar who has explained *danaben* in this passage by the equivalent of "at the *same time*," he will confer a favor by reporting it with book and place to the writer hereof.

*C. R. II., 47. It is at least worthy of remark that the Elector says in this letter that the theologians at Wittenberg had brought into summary statement the *controverted articles* of religion. He says nothing about doctrine. In the first draft of this letter it was written: "We have had it further revised, and with some words added, somewhat abridged." May the Elector not refer to the addition of the doctrinal articles, and the omission of the "*preface*"? *Urkundenbuch*, I., 191.

†De Wette, IV., 17.

‡Herzog, I., 773. See also Kolde in *Real-Encyc.*, II., 244.

its place with another on the same subject somewhat longer. I am now also treating of the power of the Keys. I wish you would run over the articles of faith. If you think there is nothing defective in them, we will treat the rest as best we can (utcunque). For they must be changed and adapted to circumstances."* Melanchthon makes this statement and request about the Confession *casually*, and as *one* item among many contained in this long letter. It is neither *said* nor *implied* that with this letter was sent to Luther a copy of the Confession, nor even a part of it. While writing this letter Melanchthon received a letter from Luther, undoubtedly that one written May 15th† in which there is *not one word about the Confession.*‡ There is no evidence that Melanchthon knew that Luther had returned the "Apology" to the Elector, and we have no notice of its having been returned before May 24th.§ Then it was in the hands of Chancellor Brück who "had to shape it before and behind." If it was brought by the messenger who brought Luther's letter to Melanchthon, as a matter of course it would be delivered to the Elector, or to the chancellor, since it concerned their business, not that of Melanchthon. Knaake and Engelhardt give the most satisfactory reasons for concluding that Melanchthon did not know that the "Apology" had been returned, as indeed it may not have been. It is the judgment of both these scholars that Melanchthon wrote under the supposition that the Apology was still in Luther's hands, since it had been sent to him both in German and Latin.|| C. R. II., 51. Two things are indisputable: (1) The letter contains not the slightest intimation of a *second sending* of the "Apology" or of any part of it. The whole face of the letter is against any such supposition. Hence they who write about a *second sending* are compelled to go outside of this letter for their proof, of which there

*C. R. II., 60.

†De Wette, IV., 16.

‡We must distinguish between Luther's letter of May 15th to the Elector, and one of the same date to Melanchthon.

§C. R. II., 62.

||*Luther's Antheil*, 58, 68: Niedner's *Zeitschrift*, 572. Köstlin, II., 426, places the return of the "Apology" not earlier than May 22.

is none, and must *assume* that Melanchthon *knew* the Apology had been returned.* (2) The letter calls Luther's attention to the articles of faith alone (Article 20 had not yet been written) and declares that the rest shall be treated according to circumstances utcunque.

It is in dispute among the learned, whether Luther received this letter of May 22nd. But there are some things about this Augsburg-Coburg correspondence that are not disputed: (1)

*Dr. Krauth, *Lutheran Monographs*, pp. 27, 28, begins the support of his theory of a *second sending* by quoting Chytraeus (*Historia Augustanae Confessionis*, p. 32) in favor of a *second sending* of the Confession to Luther, May 22nd, and gives force to the quotation by representing Chytraens as "doubtless hearing from Melanchthon's own lips the particulars connected with the great Confession at Augsburg." These are the facts: (1) In his *German* history of the Confession (Preface 1575) Chytraeus says *not one word* about a *second sending*, nor even intimates it. (2) In 1576–7 (See Preface) Coelestin published his History of the Confession, and says: "Yet (after Luther's approval May 15) Philip, some days after, sending a copy to Luther again (*remittens*), writes May 22nd." (We use Dr. Krauth's translation, who gives only a part). (3) In 1578 Chytraeus published his *Latin* History of the Confession, from *which* Dr. Krauth quotes. But lo! Chytraeus uses the very *same identical words* used by Coelestin, showing that he simply *appropriated* this statement of Coelestin, for which neither *gives any authority*; that is, instead of getting his supposed fact from "Melanchthon's own lips," Chytraeus takes an unverified assertion from Coelestin, whose reliability as a historian is utterly vitiated by the fact that he imposed upon his own Elector "a transcript from one of the less finished copies of the Confession" as a copy of the Original. Thus the first link in Dr. Krauth's chain is a link of sand. If he desired to present what Chytraeus heard from Melanchthon's own lips he should have quoted from the *German*, and not from the *Latin*, which was taken *bodily* from Coelestin. We invite scholars to examine Coelestin, I., 43^{b}, published in 1577, and Chytraeus, p. 32, published in 1578. Coelestin is the first to write about a *second sending*, but he gives no authority, and Dr. Krauth does not even *pretend* that he got the particulars from Melanchthon's own lips. Thus his authority is no authority. Again: We have examined nearly all of Dr. Krauth's witnesses, pp. 27, 28. The older ones simply give Coelestin and Chytraeus as their authorities. The later ones quote Melanchthon's letter of May 22nd as evidence that he continued to change the Confession after May 11th—which nobody ever denied. Thus Dr. Krauth's entire chain is no stronger than its first link. He hangs his theory on an unverified assertion, and that too in the face of the strongest reasons to the contrary. We ask for *proof*.

That we have no answer to this letter of May 22nd; (2) That from May 15th to June 29th there is not a solitary allusion to the Confession in Luther's extant letters (to Agricola, Jonas, the Elector, Melanchthon, the Landgrave, Schnepf) of which we have eight in DeWette; (3) That in Melanchthon's letters to Coburg after May 22nd to June 25th no reference is made to the Confession; (4) That Luther complains bitterly of the long silence of his friends at Augsburg,—one time he names "a whole month," another time, "three full weeks of continued silence"—and is so enraged that when finally letters do come, he refuses to read them.*

These things have been affirmed over and over again by the most impartial and competent scholars, and can be certified by any person who will take the trouble to read the letters extant in the *Corpus Reformatorum*, and in DeWette's *Luther's Briefe*.† Hence there is not the slightest evidence from extant letters, or from contemporaneous documents, that Luther exerted any influence on the *composition* of the Confession after the separation at Coburg, or that any word of his was given about the Confession after May 15th, or any assistance sought by any one after May 22nd, until June 25th. From the extant Augsburg-Coburg correspondence now under review, for more than a month one could not know that a confession of faith was being prepared in Augsburg.‡ But Melanchthon went on with his changes.§ May 28th the Nurenberg delegates, Kress and Vol-

*See DeWette, IV., 44, 45; C. R. II., 141.

†Pfeilschmidt says: "Three full weeks passed, from the end of May to June 19th, in which he (Luther) received no letters from Augsburg." *Luther in Coburg*, p. 57. Köstlin says: "For several weeks Luther's friends in Augsburg did not let themselves be heard from by him." II., 212; so Kolde in *Analecta Luth.* 126.

‡We might *infer* it from what Jonas writes to Luther, June 18th: "Within the next three days we will offer articles of faith." *Analecta Lutherana*, 126.

§Fikencher, after quoting Luther's letter of May 15th says: "But Melanchthon was not yet satisfied with it (the Confession), and almost up to the moment of delivery he changed so much by additions and omissions, by remodeling, and the introduction of entirely new articles, even by the choice of words, that a very different work resulted, though still based on

kamer, wrote home to their Senate "That the counsellors and theologians of the Elector are holding daily sessions on the Confession of faith, with the purpose of giving it such a form that it cannot be passed over, but must be heard."* Three days later they wrote that they have received a copy of the Confession in Latin, but that the preface and epilogue are still wanting, and that the Confession in German is daily undergoing improvements.† June 3rd they wrote that the Latin has the preface, but lacks the epilogue and an article or two behind, "on which the Saxon theologians are working."‡ June 8th they wrote: "The Saxon Confession (Verzeichniss) of faith which we last sent you (the Latin) has been laid before the preachers and Jurists for examination." Again: "The Saxons are not yet done with it." June 15th they wrote: "The Saxon Confession (Begriff) of faith is finished in German. Herewith we send it to you. It does not yet have the preface and the conclusion, and as *Philip Melanchthon* has stated, he has not put any part of those into German, because he thinks that this same preface and conclusion may probably be presented not alone in the name of the Elector, but in common in the name of all the Lutheran princes and estates, as he has already made a change in the German articles, as you will see: Namely, where in the Latin it is stated, that in the Electorate of Saxony, this or that is preached and held, here in the German he has omitted the Electorate of Saxony, and has put a common term in its place,

the Torgau Articles. On each finished part Melanchthon received the opinions of the theologians present. He even wrote to Luther May 22nd for his opinion. But he (Luther) did not see the finished work until after it had been delivered to the Emperor." *Geschichte d. Reichstags zu Augsb.*, p. 53.

Knaake referring to Melanchthon's letter of May 22nd says: "We find the purpose expressed to send nothing more to Luther, because the remaining articles about the abuses to be abolished must be changed as required by times and circumstances—reliqua utcunque tractabimus; subinde enim mutandi sunt (articuli) atque ad occasiones accommodandi sunt. In the letters exchanged between Luther and Melanchthon henceforth there is to be recognized no influence of the former on the composition of the Confession." *Luther's Antheil*, p. 76–7.

*C. R. XXV., 207. †C. R. II., 78. ‡C. R. II., 83.

which may refer to all the estates. This Confession your Excellencies will now have your preachers and jurists examine at once, and will then immediately send us their opinion and judgment. Also because nothing is being done in regard to the preface and conclusion, and nothing has yet been agreed upon with Margrave George and us about it, we think an easy way might be for us to speak with Margrave George, and then in the name of his princely grace and of your Excellencies, the matter could be mentioned to the Elector. We present this to your further consideration, and we await your decision thereon, and especially your opinion about composing the preface and conclusion, or whether we should have such with common terms with reference to a confession (Begriff) in the name of all the princes, and should send the same (Confession) first to your Excellencies to be further examined."*

This letter of June 15th makes it unquestionably certain that up to this time it had not been *decided* by the Princes to offer a confession in common. (*a*) The Confession is still called the *Saxon Confession*; (*b*) Melanchthon regards it as "probable" that it may be used as a *common confession;* (*c*) no agreement has been made with the Margrave and the Nurenbergers; (*d*) the Elector has not been formally spoken to on the subject; (*e*) the Nurenbergers ask the advice of their Senate about "a confession to be presented in common terms." Hence up to this time there was no meeting of "Princes, other officials and preachers to discuss and determine upon the Confession in regular order sentence by sentence."† And yet strange to say the most important part of this letter, namely, that which most distinctly shows that no concert of action has been decided upon, has been ignored by Dr. Krauth in his "Chronicle of the Augsburg Confession."‡ That is, he has not translated the part so adverse to his theory.

Even up to June 15th–17th the Confession is only relatively

*C. R. II., 105.

†*Conservative Reformation*, p. 233.

‡Plitt says that nothing had yet been decided upon. *Einleitung*, I. 533. Krauth says that "it is hoped the Confession will be presented to the Emperor in the name of all the Protestants." *Chronicle*, p. 40.

finished, as we learn from the Nurenbergers' letter of June 19th.* No more articles were added, but the Epilogue is yet to be attached, the whole is yet to be examined by the princes and counsellors, the text is to be fixed, and the Confession is to be signed. And we know further that for at least two days Melanchthon practically suspended work on the Confession in the hope that the whole matter in dispute might be settled "in Enge und Stille."

June 15th the Emperor came. Early in the morning the princes assembled in the *Rathhaus* to arrange for his reception. There was a long dispute about precedence and rank. At two o'clock they go forth to meet him. He enters the city between eight and nine o'clock P. M., and detains the Protestant princes until between ten and eleven, haranguing them about interdicting preaching and about joining the Corpus Christi procession the next day. The excitement was so great that some were called out of bed, and informed of what was going on.†

June 16th. At seven o'clock A. M., the Protestant princes (the Elector excepted, who was indisposed on account of the late detention the previous evening) appeared before the Emperor, and gave reasons why they could not interdict preaching, nor enter the procession. They were detained until ten o'clock.‡ Then they visited the indisposed Elector, and there resolved to make a written answer to the Emperor. This appears to have been the first united action of the princes, but this action does not take in the Confession. They resolved to make reply to the Emperor in writing. Chancellor Brück wrote the long opinion, giving reasons why the evangelical princes could not interdict preaching; and the Saxon theologians prepared the *Bedenken* on the question, "Whether the Elector and other Protestant princes can take part without violation of conscience in the procession of Corpus Christi Day."§ In the contemporaneous re-

*C. R. II., 112.

†See *Urkundenbuch*, I., 263; Schirrmacher's *Briefe und Acten*, p. 54, 57, 59. C. R. II., 106. ‡Schirrmacher, 61, 482; C. R. II., 111.

§See these papers in *Urkundenbuch*, I., 283 et seq.; Schirrmacher, 64; C. R. II,. 110.

ports of this day we hear nothing about the Confession. Everybody was busy with other matters. See the letter of the Nurenberg delegates, June 16th (C. R. II., 106–7). June 17th. In the morning the princes presented their reasons to the Emperor for not interdicting preaching.* Adam Weiss preached before the Elector, and John Rurer under instruction from Margrave George preached in the church of St. Catharine.† In the afternoon Melanchthon had a conference with the imperial secretaries, Schlepper and Valdesius. Here he declared that the difference between the Protestants and the Catholics has reference chiefly to Priestly Celibacy, Private Mass and Communion in both kinds.‡

June 18th. The Protestant Princes assembled at the *Rathhaus* in the forenoon to hear the imperial decision in regard to preaching. They made reply, and at first refused obedience. It was finally agreed that preaching should cease on both sides.§ Adam Weiss preached before the Elector.|| Melanchthon had another interview with Valdesius. It was proposed to settle the dissension without having the Confession read. Melanchthon promised to consider the matter.¶ In the evening the royal interdict of preaching was proclaimed.

We thus see that for three days the princes were occupied almost exclusively with the matter of the preaching. Hence Melanchthon could write: "This matter was in dispute three entire days;"—"This matter was then in dispute three days;" —"At once he (the Emperor) forbade ours to preach. As they did not immediately obey, the dispute lasted three days."** The theologians were occupied in preparing *Bedenken*, in preaching and in holding interviews. He who looks at the documents which were prepared during these three days as given by Förstemann and Schirrmacher, simply wonders that so much could

*Schirrmacher, 66, 483; Förstemann, I., 283–290.
†Schirr., 483, Urk., 268; Pfeilschmidt, 55, Müller, 545.
‡Schmidt, *Philip Melanchthon*, p. 195. C. R. II., 122.
§Schirrm., 58 et seq., Pfeilschmidt, 55.
||*Urk.*, I., 268; Schirrm., 484.
¶Schmidt, 196.
**C. R. II., 117. 118. *Letters* by Bindseil, 61.

have been transacted. And yet in all these documents and contemporaneous reports, including the two letters of the Nurenberg delegates of the 16th, we have not found a word about the Confession. Indeed we know positively, that work on the Confession was suspended, and that it was in danger of being abandoned.*

June 19th the Nurenberg delegates wrote: "Yesterday before breakfast your two latest letters were answered by us. Then we went first to our Gracious Lord the Margrave, and afterwards to our Gracious Lord the Elector. In both places we find that his Electoral and his Princely Grace, learn with pleasure that your Excellencies will unite with their Princely Graces. They also graciously declare that in this matter they will associate you with themselves, and allow the affairs of his Electoral and his Princely Grace and of your Excellencies to go together. And though Margrave George, with his answer and promise, was clearer and franker than the Saxon, yet we do not anticipate any failure on the part of the Saxon." They go on to say that the Epilogue is not yet prepared, and that Melanchthon is contemplating a briefer statement; and they promise further information.†

This letter shows an advance in concert of action; but (*a*) such action is not yet consummated, (*b*) at present it contemplates only the two princes mentioned and Nurenberg, (*c*) there is still an element of uncertainty in the Elector, (*d*) the Confession is not yet complete, (*e*) Melanchthon is uncertain about the future of the Confession. Only partially then and contingently has the Confession, which is still called "the Confession of his Electoral Grace," become a common document. Dr. Krauth has ignored that part of the letter quoted above. We do not

*Schmidt, 196; C. R. XXVI., 209, 210; C. R. II., 112. Also Kolde in *Real-Encyc.* 249.

It is passing strange that Dr. Krauth should ignore absolutely the transactions of June 17th and 18th. Perhaps he did it because he found no allusion during these days to the Confession, as certainly he found none and no record of any transactions about the Confession, on 16th. *Lutheran Monographs*, p. 41.

†C. R. II., 112.

hesitate to say that this letter alone is fatal to his theory noticed below.

In the afternoon of this day all the princes assembled at the palace and settled some of their disputes. Melanchthon wrote several letters, and Brentz a long one to Isenmann. None of the documents speak of any action on the Confession on that day, which was Sunday.

June 20th. The Elector and the princes go to the palace at seven o'clock, A. M. The Elector carries the sword before the Emperor at Mass. Pimpinelli delivers a long oration in Latin. The Diet is formally opened at the *Rathhaus*. The Imperial Proposition about Religion, requiring the Electors, Princes and Estates to exhibit their doctrines and grievances in German and Latin, is delivered. The session lasts till one o'clock P. M. In the evening the Elector assembles his allies in religion at his own residence, and exhorts them to steadfastness.*

June 21st. In the morning the Elector gives himself to prayer and reading the Psalms. Later he calls his son, Brück and Melanchthon, and talks confidentially over the affairs of religion with them. He declares that "he will make no declaration without the consent and counsel of those allied with them in religion."† At two o'clock he calls the Estates together, has the Imperial Proposition read, and requests each one to give his opinion the next day.‡ The Nurenberg delegates write a long letter to their senate, finishing it at 5 o'clock P. M. They then add the following "Postscript": "After we had finished this letter, I, Kress, was called to the Elector's residence. His Electoral Grace, Margrave George, and the counsellors of Hesse and Lüneberg were there. In the presence of the Elector and of Margrave George, they declare simply, that, inasmuch as the Elector has already prepared a confession of faith, a copy of which your Excellencies have received, they, through us, have offered to join the Elector. At this time they are holding a

*See Schirrm., 73 et seq; C. R. II., 122; Coelestin, I., 105–121; Müller, 564.

†Coelestin, II., 122; Müller, 568.

‡Coelestin, I., 122[b]; Müller, 568.

session over the articles, and are further revising, stating and finishing them. It is the desire also of the Princes that your Excellencies should immediately send your preachers, or whom you will, but especially *Osiander*, and would instruct them to help us to consider and deliberate over these articles, and whatever is needed in the transaction."*

This "Postscript," which also has been *ignored* by Dr. Krauth in his *Chronicle*, makes it as clear as day, that not until this hour, had it been agreed to make the Saxon Confession the common Confession of all the Evangelical Princes. It is distinctly announced by the representatives of Hesse and Lüneburg, that they have joined the Saxon, inasmuch as he has already prepared a confession. It is altogether probable that they are brought to this conclusion now rather hurriedly, because of the Imperial Proposition which demanded a confession in Latin and German from each one, and because of the violence shown by their enemies at the opening of the Diet.† The Confession is now undergoing revision as a *common document.* The Nurenbergers are officially asked to take part. A common faith, a common danger and a common requisition unite the Protestants in a common Confession.

The next day (June 22nd) the Protestants are notified to present their Confession on June 24th. Salig says the theologians worked night and day, and the Nurenberg delegates tell us: "Last Thursday (23rd) early we and the delegate from Reutlingen were summoned before the Saxon, the Hessian, Margrave George and Lüneburg. There, in the presence of all their princely graces, their counsellors, and theologians, of whom there were twelve, besides other scholars and doctors, the aforesaid Confession was read over, examined and considered in order to present the same yesterday afternoon to his Imperial Majesty."‡ It is an undisputed fact that the text of the Augsburg Confession was officially fixed (though Melanchthon continued to make verbal changes), and, in all probability, signed

*C. R. II., 124.
†Plitt, II., 533.
‡C. R. II., 127.

at this time. It is henceforth the Augsburg Confession of History. The Protestants failed to get a hearing, June 24th, but the day following, the Confession was read before the Emperor and the assembled Princes in the small chapel of the Episcopal palace. The two copies, Latin and German, were handed to the Emperor, who gave the German to the Elector of Mayence for preservation in the imperial archives, and kept the Latin in his own hands. Both copies are lost.

Bringing together the chief facts connected with the composition of the Confession, we find:

1. The Confession in its *first draft* was sent to Luther May 11th, and returned with his approval. Eleven days later Melanchthon asks Luther "to run over the articles of faith," but determines to treat the rest *utcunque.* There is absolutely no proof, nor even a valid reason for believing that the Confession, or a part of it, was *sent* to Luther a *second time.* There is not a line of contemporaneous evidence to show that Luther was consulted in regard to the Confession or any part of it from May 22nd till after June 25th. In this long interval, by the advice and assistance of the theologians and the civil counsellors, Melanchthon was bringing the Confession into its final shape.

2. The theory promulgated some years ago by the late Dr. C. P. Krauth,* that some time after June 14th the Confession in "its final form," "in the presence of the Princes and other officials, and of the preachers, was discussed and determined upon in regular course, sentence by sentence," and then sent to Luther a *third time*, and received back again with his approval, and *after this* delivered to the Emperor—this theory is not sustained by a single syllable of the abundant literature in the form of official letters and documents of those eventful days, nor by the private letters of the same period. We have seen that every available hour of time for the eight or ten days next after June 14th, was occupied in other business. There are over four hundred sentences in the Confession. Allowing the ab-

**Lutheran Monographs*, p. 61; *Conserv. Reformation*, 232–3.

surdly short time of ten minutes to "discuss and determine upon" each sentence, more than sixty-six hours would be required. It is absolutely impossible to find so many hours in that period (June 14th–24th), not otherwise occupied. Besides, the four letters of the Nurenberg delegates (June 8th, 16th, 19th, 21st) which show the beginning, progress and consummation of the idea of unity of presentation, but which Dr. Krauth has ignored in the way indicated above, make it absolutely certain that no such *discussion and determining upon* as the theory asserts, could have taken place until after 5 o'clock, June 21st, as not until after that hour did "it (the Confession) ripen into the absolute unity of presentation known as the Augsburg Confession."* Prior to this time it was still the *Saxon* Confession, as the documents show, and now, as it required eight days to go from Augsburg to Coburg and back, the time is too short. The Confession is finally revised, June 23rd and presented, June 25th. Moreover, Melanchthon, in two lengthy accounts given by him of the composition of the Confession, speaks of only *one* sending to Luther.† In the account written in German, Luther's approbation of the Confession is made to occur *prior* to the careful examination of all the articles by the Princes and others. In the account written in Latin, the reverse is the order. If there be a contradiction between the accounts, the contradiction does not affect the number of the times the Confession was sent, but the order of events. *In either case only one sending is noted.* We know that sending occurred May 11th. The order of events is secondary. Two things Melanchthon means to affirm: (1) That the Confession was sent to Luther and received his approbation; (2) that it was carefully examined by the Princes *et al.* The documents show when it was sent to and approved by Luther, and that it was examined by the Princes *et al.* Thus what the documents exhibit Melanchthon affirms. The chain of evidence is complete.

June 56th Melanchthon wrote to Luther *inter alia:* "Our defense (Confession) has been presented to the Emperor. I

**Luth. Monographs*, p. 31.

†C. R. IX., 929, 1051 et seqq.

send it to you to read." The next day he wrote to Veit Dietrich who was with Luther and says: "Write me back the Doctor's opinion of it," and again after three days to the same: "I would like to know whether the Doctor is in a better humor, and what he thinks of the Apology."* There would be no sense in sending Luther the Confession "to read," and of inquiring for his opinion, if only a few days before, he had read the Confession in its "final form," and had expressed his approbation of it. Barring one slight allusion, which cannot be understood from the context, Dr. Krauth has ignored the parts of these three letters translated above, and yet they belong to the *chronicle* of the Augsburg Confession. Certainly they do not favor his theory.

For a masterly criticism of Dr. Krauth's translation of Latin, and for an unanswered and unanswerable refutation of his *theory* of a *third sending*, the reader is referred to the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, Vol. VIII., 1878, p. 621 et seqq. A theory so utterly destitute of historical validity, and so chronologically impossible, would not have been noticed here, but for the fact that many persons who do not have access to the sources of information continue in their innocence to perpetuate the vain delusion. Those who would know all the facts about the Augsburg Confession and the transactions of the Evangelicals from June 14th to June 25th, must look to the original contemporaneous documents found in Vols. II. and XXVI., *Corpus Reformatorum*, in Schirrmacher's *Briefe und Acten*, and in Vol. I., of Förstemann's *Urkundenbuch*, and not to "A Chronicle of the Augsburg Confession," pp. 40–46, by Dr. Krauth, who omits more, and in some particulars *more important* matters, than he includes in his *Chronicle*.

See C. R. II., 141, 147, 158.

ARTICLE II.

CHRISTIAN BURIAL.

By George U. Wenner, D. D.

There is a close relation between dogma and liturgy. The present condition of the Protestant funeral service is an example. Our Office for the Dead is an incomplete structure. Even among ministers there is considerable disagreement on such simple questions as the subject, the object and the mode of Christian burial. Among all the services we are called on to render in our ministry that of the funeral is probably the least satisfactory.

Our doctrine concerning death and the hereafter has had but a meagre development, and hence our practice in relation to the dead moves on a somewhat uncertain plane. The very name Protestant implies negation, and in the field of eschatology particularly we are more famous for declaring what we do not believe than what we do believe. Our church orders are particular in declaring what should not be done, but comparatively backward in constructing a positive system to take the place of the rejected one.

The early church had little trouble in its thought about the hereafter or in construing its relations to the departed. Their brethren who had died in Christ had gone to be with Jesus, but the mutual relation that had existed between them was not severed by death. Even the natural heart knows that love cannot die. And if we may love them, why may they not also love us? The accompanying sentiment of Charles Kingsley represents the common thought of the early church: "Love is not dead. It lives still in the next world for you, and perhaps with you. For why should not those who are gone, if they are gone to their Lord, be actually nearer us, not farther from us, in the heavenly world?" But in addition to this they knew what the natural man did not know, that the Church of Christ was but

one body. "Part of the host have crossed the flood, and part are crossing now." This was enough to establish a mutual relation, and to afford a basis for prayers for the dead and by the dead. If the dead brother was a martyr or saint, one comparatively rich therefore in spiritual gifts, his mediation and prayers would naturally be sought by the living. If on the other hand he was poor in spiritual treasure, why should not the living seek to help him with their prayers? Even such a clear thinker as St. Augustine never for a moment supposed that there was anything wrong in such conceptions. When doubt was first cast upon it, unfortunately it came from a heretical quarter, the church was paralyzed with horror, nor did it deem the suggestion worthy of a reply.

But in course of time the mediatorial office of Christ was overlooked and the mediation of saints took its place. Furthermore, the church undertook to provide for the salvation of the departed with the same confidence as for the living. Hence in the Roman Catholic system, death marks the beginning of an entirely new series of services and efforts on the part of the church in behalf of the dead.

The Reformation began in the domain of soteriology, and yet it was an eschatological question, the state of souls in purgatory, and in view thereof the rule of indulgences, that became one of the immediate occasions of the movement. *The* question of the Reformation was, "What must I do to be saved?" The answer was: "In repentance and faith accept the finished work of the only Mediator." With this searchlight the whole system of existing customs and opinions was illuminated, and men were able to see with perfect clearness what was wrong in the old teaching. Two things particularly were made clear by her central doctrines. One was that if a man died in Christ, in a state of justification, he was saved and had no further need of the prayers and the work of the church. The other was that we have no Scriptural authority for endeavoring to promote the salvation of the departed, on the other hand the present life is declared to be our only state of probation. With such a doctrine there was no room for most of the funeral practices of the ante-reforma-

tion church, and the pruning knife was therefore relentlessly applied. But there has been a development of dogma since that time. One of the most important periods, as affecting our subject, was that of Rationalism. Its influence was of a far-reaching character. Rationalism had no use for the text "The wages of sin is death," or for the doctrine that life is a probation which ends in death. Having no faith in the resurrection and no fear of the judgment, its funeral addresses were limited to sentimental commonplaces, or to expressions of sweet sympathy with the friends and of respect for the remains of the departed. Worse than all, it preached a new gospel of redemption, for death made angels of us all, and all a man had to do in order to get to heaven was to die. We are living in another period it is true, but I am not sure that the echoes of that system do not still linger among us.

I propose to offer some thoughts on the subject of the Christian Burial Service. But before doing so, there are two preliminary questions connected with our subject. The first of these is, Upon whom does the duty of Christian burial devolve? Is it a family matter, the duty of the nearest kin? Or has the church a duty in relation to it? The oldest Christian burial service of which we have any knowledge is described by Tertullian, in the second century. When any one died, the ministers and congregation were called together and a public service was held, in all respects as at other times except that in the act of oblation, the general prayer that preceded the communion, mention was made of the deceased and thanksgiving and intercession were offered in his behalf. At the same time offerings were brought for the poor and for widows and orphans. This was before the introduction of distinctively Roman Catholic errors and has nothing to do with the questions involved therein. The point to be noted is that it was a church service, and not a private affair.

The Reformation maintained the same principle, that an honorable burial was a church burial. It was preceded by the tolling of the bells to call the people together, and included singing, prayer, a funeral sermon and the benediction. In call-

ing it a church funeral, we do not mean that it necessarily was held in the church building. It was a funeral conducted by the Christian congregation and by the minister in its name.

The reason for this seems to have been a desire on the part of the church to manifest the fellowship of believers both of the living and of the dead. It was also an opportunity to give emphatic expression to the church's doctrine of the resurrection.

This practice of the Christian centuries still finds wide recognition. The feeling prevails that to save a funeral from being *non honestus*, a minister must be called in to officiate at the ceremonies. This is entirely apart from the question whether the deceased was a communicant or not.

It may be asked here whether other than Christian ceremonies may be allowed at a funeral service. If the minister has simply been hired for the occasion, to supplement, as it were, the arrangements of the undertaker, it is not a serious question. But if he is there in his representative capacity, as a minister of the church, it *is* a question. I once heard a bishop make a speech at a burial in which no allusion was made to Jesus and the resurrection. All I can remember is that he said something about the Great Architect and the Everlasting East, and then some men with white aprons on them walked around and threw pieces of evergreen into the grave.

The second preliminary question that occurs to us is: "Who are proper objects of Christian burial." A general answer to this question is that only Christians are entitled to it. The church of Rome extends the prohibition to unbaptized infants. So also does the Church of England.* The Lutheran Church† on the other hand does not exclude the unbaptized children of Christian parents on the ground that our salvation does not depend on baptism, and that it is not the omission of the sacrament, but the contempt thereof that condemns.

The canon law also denied Christian burial to the excommu-

*The Protestant Episcopal Church in America does not.

†Or rather Lutheran teaching, for among Lutherans we emphasize rather the doctrine which is accepted in certain churches known as Lutheran than the doctrine of a body known as the Church.

nicate, to suicides, to those who had fallen in duel, to usurers, robbers, incendiaries, to violators of churches, to such as had failed to commune during the past year, to well-known blasphemers, to apostates, to schismatics and to heretics.

The Church of England denies it only to the unbaptized, the excommunicate and to suicides. In the case of dissenters it has been decided that the clergyman may omit the service if the friends of the deceased desire it. "In cases of notorious wickedness or infidelity a clergyman may omit the office, but he must be prepared to abide the consequences. But it is held in the majority of cases even where the life has been notoriously evil, that the sinner has not been utterly forsaken by God's mercy in his death. In Lancashire Roman Catholics have constantly been buried without any service in the church or churchyard; while on the other hand at the burial of Robert Owen, and of a notorious infidel, the clergymen thought it their duty to say the service, in the face of a strong protest against its use on the part of the relatives."*

The Lutheran practice denies Christian burial to the excommunicate, to suicides,† to open despisers of the divine word and sacraments, to those who have died under conviction of a capital crime, and to those who have fallen in the duel. According to Lutheran practice the bodies of Heathen, Turks, Jews and Socinians may not be interred in God's acre. On the other hand Romanists and the adherents of the Reformed faith, are not excluded. But in Electoral Saxony it was prescribed that the funeral of Catholics and Calvinists must be conducted privately and with the omission of the usual ceremonies. The Liturgy of the Reformed Dutch Church, 1854, contains no burial service. In regard to the practice of the various dissenting branches of the English Church I have not been able to learn the exact principle which governs them. Their services seem to be largely eclectic and they borrow freely from the Protestant Episcopal liturgy.

After this preliminary glance at the proper subject and the

*See Blunt's Annotated Book of Common Prayer.

†Unless irresponsible at the time the act was committed.

proper object of Christian burial we will consider the mode of conducting it. According to the Lutheran view a funeral properly consisted of two parts, first the Procession and secondly the Service. To the Procession belonged the tolling of the bell, the presence of the congregation, the presence of the minister and school, the singing of hymns and the burial.

The bell was tolled not merely to advise the people of the hour of the funeral, but also as a *memento mori.* The presence of the congregation was regarded as a Christian duty and a work of love, and ministers were constantly instructed to impress upon their people the importance of this duty not only in the case of the rich but especially in the case of the poor.

The use of processional hymns is very ancient and was gladly adopted by the Church which was distinguished for taking a new flight in Christian song.

Some of the famous Latin hymns were the *Dies irae*, *Vexilla regis* and Notker's *media vita.* The last named is used in prose form in the English service and in that form has of course lost most of its beauty and impressiveness. In its German form by Luther, *Mitten wir im Leben sind mit dem Tod umfangen*, it has an indescribable majesty and solemnity.* The *Vexilla regis* dates from the sixth century and is derived from the beautiful custom of carrying a large cross at the head of the funeral procession. I cannot forbear quoting a few stanzas from Neale's translation:

"The royal banners forward go, The cross shines forth in mystic glow;
Where He in flesh, our flesh who made, Our sentence bore, our ransom paid.
Upon its arms like balance true, He weighed the price for sinners due,
The price which none but He could pay, And spoiled the spoiler of his prey."

Besides these translations from the Latin there are a number of classic German hymns.

The committal service among Protestants is peculiar to the Anglicans. It is derived from the Roman Catholics who in

*"In the Middle Ages it was adopted as a dirge on all melancholy occasions in Germany; armies used it as a battle song; and superstitious ideas of its miraculous power rose to such a height, that in the year 1316 the Synod of Cologne forbade the people to sing it at all except on such occasions as were allowed by their bishop." Blunt, p. 480.

turn may have borrowed the symbolism from the ancient Romans. A reference to the custom is found in one of the odes of Horace. In the Greek Church the priest casts earth on the body saying: "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, the compass of the round world, and they that dwell therein." From the English book it found its way into many modern rituals, into Germany by way of Prussia in 1822. It is an expression of the feeling that some formality should be observed, some symbolical act performed. Under Puritan influence it has undergone many changes, and it is still open to serious question. Our own orders prescribe no ceremony; but the order of Ott Heinrich, 1547, suggests the following: After the Hymn the Antiphon "I am the resurrection and the life" may be used, or "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again." And after the casket has been lowered into the grave the minister shall say: "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord," &c.

Immediately after the procession the service was held, that is an act of preaching and prayer. While there was no uniformity in the orders of the various countries, the following were the essential constituents of the service: The Lessons, the Sermon and the Prayers. The lessons were John 11, 1 Cor. 15: 20 to 26, 1 Thess. 4, and Job 19. For the funeral of a young man Luke 7, and for that of a young girl Matt. 9. Besides it was prescribed that the funeral texts should be read distinctly from *the book*, naming the chapter.* The Protestant Episcopal Church has but one lesson of 39 verses, which is in quantity too much, and in scope too little. On the other hand the practice of many ministers of selecting short passages from all parts of the Scripture, having more or less bearing on the subject, frequently curtailing the texts themselves in order to make them fit, is unchurchly and reprehensible.

The sermon is the *crux* of the funeral service in our day. Not everyone has the boldness of the Methodist preacher who when called upon to officiate at the funeral of a man of doubtful career, simply said: "Good I cannot say of him, bad I dare not say of him. Take him up and bury him;" or the commanding

*See Kliefoth, p. 142.

dignity of Dr. Adams at the funeral of Rufus Choate. After recounting the eminent gifts and services of the deceased, he closed by saying: "On the subject of his regeneration, I have nothing to say."

Although it was recognized that the funeral sermon involved a severe tax upon the minister's time, it was considered a duty that should not be omitted. When God visits men, the sermon will touch the heart more than at other times. It was permissible to make mention of the deceased in the sermon, what he had been to his church and to his family. If any one had occupied a high station and had conducted himself therein in an upright and Christian manner, account might be made of it to the praise of God, only it must be done in a moderate and God-fearing manner. In latter times rationalism produced panegyrics that were a disgrace to the pulpit, but the church was not to blame for that. The object of the sermon was to teach, to console, to admonish. The themes that were to be treated were such as, "The wages of sin is death;" "the uncertainty of life, but the certainty of the redemption of Christ;" that he that keepeth his word shall not see death; the resurrection of the dead and the glory and joy of the everlasting life; and how every Christian should prepare himself for a blessed departure from this life. These it will be observed are very old-fashioned themes.

In order to avoid a disagreeable responsibility, there has been a disposition in certain quarters to omit the sermon, and simply to read the service. The question is sometimes asked whether a funeral sermon ever converted anybody. Many sermons probably are not constructed for that purpose. And it does almost seem like taking an unfair advantage of the mourners, to preach at them in the hour of their deep sorrow. But on the other hand, the messenger of God must not be unmindful of his office and duty.

It may be a superfluous question whether the prayers should contain intercession for the dead. Nevertheless it is not altogether uncalled for. The impulse to pray for the departed is one that lies very close to the human heart. And history is

altogether in its favor. In Tertullian's time the practice had been in existence from time immemorial. Luther answers the question in this way: "As the Scripture says nothing about it, I do not regard it a sin if in your own secret prayer you offer some such petition as this: 'Dear God, if the soul is in such a state as that help may still be given, be gracious,' &c. And when you have done this once or twice, let that be sufficient."

The dogmaticians took up the question with the result that all petitions or forms of prayer for the dead are excluded from the public service. While secret prayer for the dead is not forbidden, public prayer, other than thanksgiving is expressly forbidden.

The first prayer of the Anglican book is now free from that element, but it is a redaction of a prayer that distinctly included intercession for the dead.

It is a growing custom in the Episcopal Church to celebrate the communion in connection with a funeral. The relation of this celebration to the masses for the dead and the remembrance of the horrible abuses connected therewith, renders it unnecessary to consider the question from a Protestant standpoint.

There are two customs in our Church which I venture to mention as not being in conflict with evangelical doctrine and as serving to edification.

The first is the parentation or thanksgiving. On the Sunday following the funeral mention is made of the departed at the church service, thanks are returned to God for the blessings he has bestowed, and intercession is made on behalf of the family and friends some such form as follows may be observed: "It has pleased God to call away from this world our brother * * in the * * year of his age. And the content of the prayer might be something like this: We give thanks unto thee our heavenly Father for all the blessings which thou hast bestowed upon our brother in this life. We beseech thee to visit with the consolations of thy word the hearts of all who have been bereaved. Teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts to wisdom. Help us to look for the blessed appearing of thy Son

Jesus Christ and bring us at last to the company of thy saints, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Such a service it seems to me would mightily strengthen among our people the feeling of fellowship and would be a tender and loving service for the family. Another custom which I would recommend is the observance of a memorial Sunday. In place of All Saints' Day, to which some doctrinal exception might be taken, we observe the last Sunday of the Church Year as a memorial Sunday. The entire service is indeed a funeral service in memory of the departed of the year. Some of our strict churchmen suspect that it contains the leaven of Romanism, but it is now almost universal in Germany. I have found it to be very edifying and it unquestionably responds to a craving of the heart.

I end as I began with a feeling that our funeral service is an imperfect relic. We may prune a little here and restore a little there, but what we need is an original structure, along historical lines, but nevertheless on the basis of clearly defined Protestant doctrine. But as to the spirit of the service we shall doubtless all agree. It is no place for sentimental sympathy, for lugubrious rhetoric, or for idolatrous adulation. On the one hand it should be pervaded with the solemnity of God's judgment. But on the other hand it should lift us up to the glory of the resurrection, and to the joy of Paradise "where they that loved are blest, where loyal hearts and true stand ever in the light, All rapture through and through, In God's most holy sight."

ARTICLE III.

THE PREACHING FOR A THEOLOGICAL CRISIS.

[INAUGURAL ADDRESS AS PROFESSOR IN WITTENBERG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, SPRINGFIELD, OHIO.]

BY PROFESSOR DAVID H. BAUSLIN, D. D.

Mr. President, Members of the Board of Directors, Fathers and Brethren:

In the charge just given by the President of the Board of Directors you have been gratified and I have been encouraged as well as admonished. If this service had no other object it might now very properly be brought to a close; but the law of custom which imposes upon me the task upon which I now enter, doubtless has its foundation in good reason and does not merely aim at meeting a conventional propriety. He who occupies the part of instructor in a theological school does not discharge his important functions before the public, and yet he is in some sense responsible to the people, and as such it is fitting that once at least, in entering upon his charge, the public should know in what spirit his work is to be done. Before announcing the subject of the address, you will indulge a word that is personal, inasmuch as in a peculiar sense I enter upon the duties of a new work, after years of happy pastoral experience, with the twofold inspiration of responsibility and gratitude. I am to succeed in the chair of Practical Theology a personal friend; a man whose Christian virtues, large experience, fidelity to his Church in trying circumstances, valuable and long-continued services, led us to hope for yet some years of service in this chair, had not the Head of the Church, to whose ways though inscrutable we must humbly bow, ordered otherwise. More than this, my professorship is the fitting memorial in our "school of the prophets," and in the Church of his affection and service of one of the church's most widely known and useful layman, who is not because God hath taken him; a man whose nobility of character and devotion to his Church and the

Church's Lord, have left an abiding impress among such as knew and honored him when living. It will also be admitted to be a rare felicity, that, in accordance with the conditions of the foundation of this professorship, I was nominated to this important function, and that without solicitation or intimation, on my part, by one who knew me as pastor and preacher. I desire accordingly in these introductory remarks to express in this public way my high appreciation of the honor thus conferred upon me by the noble Christian woman, who has honored Christian stewardship in the benefaction which has made this work and position possible, in our cherished school for ministerial training.

Having taken the obligation wisely required by the Board of Directors of its theological teachers, and in view of the history of our seminary in recent years, I desire, on this occasion, to reiterate with the emphasis of reassertion, my entire accord with that part of the doctrinal basis upon which our schools rests, and which has been declared by our General Synod to be "a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine word, and of the faith of our Church founded upon that word." With an earnest desire not to be misunderstood or misinterpreted, I come to declare that that I accept, hold and teach *ex animo*, as my doctrinal basis, and that with the governing principles, the history, spirit and life of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, as that body has interpreted itself, and with a hearty belief in its peculiar mission among the religious bodies of this country, I find myself in increasing and affectionate sympathy, as well as in hearty and fraternal accord with my honored and able teachers and colleagues.

Called to be henceforth occupied with the subject of preaching, that chief lever of an evangelical ministry, I have desired to discuss some theme not purely in the abstract, but in its practical relations. As congenial with existing tendencies of thought, and as pertinent to the duties of my professorship and this occasion, I shall invite your further attention to a theme of which this is the most general expression—"The preaching for a theological crisis."

THE PREACHING FOR A THEOLOGICAL CRISIS.

Each age has its own theological work to do. Whatever truth there may be in that, frequently unexpressed, expectation that as the world grows old and the coming of the Lord draws nearer, there will be some conflict between truth and error, greater perhaps than has ever been known before, this certainly is true that each age of the Church must expect its own difficulties and face its own problems. The history of the Church tells us how that error has assumed its own peculiar form in each century. We cannot live entirely on the inheritance of the past even if we would. We must make it our own, by enriching it by the fruits of our own exertions and vigorously maintaining its permanent elements. We can easily characterize the larger movements in Christian Theology which have constituted epochs by comparing their respective proportion of subjective and objective. We may justly classify Mysticism, Pietism, and Idealism as excessively subjective, while Rationalism and Skepticism are exclusively so. The arid periods in religious thought have been those in which efforts have been made to fuse the contents of revelation into harmony with the thinking, feeling and life of their respective ages, and subordinating at the same time such elements of the truth, as are perfect and unchangeable, because divine in their origin. What is to be desired, manifestly, is the just proportion of objective and subjective in the measure of their legitimate importance. There is an actual objective relation to which we must look for our religion and theology, as there is an actual world of matter to which we must look for our natural sciences. The source of our knowledge is Christianity, and it is Christianity concerning which we are to gain some knowledge. That Christianity is a real history wrought out in events which have unquestionably occurred and which are component parts of earthly history, while back of this history and expressing themselves through it are certain immutable doctrines and principles of truth. It is one of the clear gains of modern religious thought that we rest back upon a solid basis of facts, which basis rests in turn upon solid, essential principles which are immutably true, and which have been wrested from cotem-

porary error in some of the great conflicts which have been waged for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints.

The ancient Greek Church, for example, is the mother of œcumenical orthodoxy. She elaborated in the great councils of the Church the fundamental dogmas of the Trinity and the Person of Christ as those dogmas are stated in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds. The Latin Church devoted her strength to the problems of anthropology and her splendid contribution to religious thought and progress is the Augustinian theology, with its profound views and experiences of sin and grace. The schoolmen of the Middle Ages formalized, analyzed and systematized the the doctrines of the fathers and showed the harmony of revelation and reason. The Mystics of the same period, placing the emphasis upon the subject who receives the objective revelation, insisted on a theology of the heart and an inward spiritual experience. With the Reformation was born evangelical theology, from the fresh fountain of the Scriptures, and in heroic conflict with the errors of Romanism. We find its germs in the struggles of conscience and the resulting action of a German monk. It dealt with the basis of all religion—the relation of man to God and the duties depending upon that relation. Since that time soteriology and the subjective side of Christianity in its bearing upon the character and comfort of the individual believer have received more attention than ever before. The Wesleyan movement in the last century largely dealt with recalling men from the limitations put upon the divine purpose by some aspects of the Latin theology. A great scholar of Germany has recently expressed the belief that questions of ecclesiology and eschatology will come last and next in the order of religious problems. Whether or not his forecast may be correct, certain we are of this, that the burning questions just now are Christology in its historical aspects and Bibliology in its relation to modern criticism and scientific methods and discoveries. The theological problems peculiar to our times centre in the two last named subjects. Their discussion has largely partaken of the characteristic spirit of the age, which is largely given to the exaltation of purely utilitarian interests. The age spirit reminds one of the olden times when a wild war of errors

was contending for the mastery and the equipoise of truth was singularly lacking. Modern theological thought is not one thing but many, and presents a wide field of energetic, varied and somewhat antagonistic movements. It is subject to many influences. It is affected by the progress—the natural progress, of the various subordinate parts of the one "Queen of the sciences," which are, as it were, the tools with which theology works. It has benefited by improved methods of exegesis, and by the increasing agreement about the principles according to which the sense of Scripture should be elicited. The prosecution of the work of biblical theology, as a distinct department, has done much both to clear and enrich theological thought. A very sensible effect likewise has been produced by the study of historical theology. The calm, comparative survey of the work of different schools of thinkers, the curious dissection of each competing system, with a view to assign the theological motive to each—such studies have produced a mental attitude toward controversies distinctly different from that which once obtained. New modes of centering theological thought, new assignments of the axis on which it should revolve modify from time to time the cast of prevailing conceptions. It is not possible that the pursuit of even these lofty themes should be prosecuted uninfluenced by the age spirit, and accordingly they have been engaged in with a full dependence on the power of truth and a readiness to court the freest investigation. They have been pursued in the face of a state of mind, both within and without the Church, which is impatient of closed questions. Men may be conscious of the fact that they are not infallible; but in our day they are especially prone to doubt whether former times were more so than these. What right, they are asking, had early ages to close up the greatest questions pertaining to God and to man? The old creeds are noble monuments of Christian thought and feeling, say they; but are they certainly true because they are old? Did the Nicene Council really know more than we about the *Θεός ἐκ Θεου; Φῶς εκ Φωτός?* That the language may be noble and true, venerable and sublime, is not the question. The question is: is it certainly true because *they* said it? Is there any point in what we may call the precipita-

tion or crystallization of doctrine at which it passes out of the region of inquiry, and enters that of final and ascertained truth, so as to become a part of universal orthodoxy or right belief? Long ago Lord Bacon showed us that we are the true ancients who live in the mature age of the world, whereas our fathers lived in infancy. Accordingly men are saying that we have access to all the light our fathers had as well as to all that has been accumulated since their time, and ask the privilege and claim the right of judging for themselves. Such language and such sentiments as these, applied to the great problems of Christian theology, are not entirely bad, and are even safe with proper restrictions. But it is possible to use such language, to express such sentiments, in a spirit of mere flippant irreverence for the conclusions of men immeasurably nobler and larger than those who thus talk. There is a questioning which is not a search for truth, but rather an ostentatious display of one of the cheapest and most childish qualities of the mind, viz.: intellectual pertness.

Men are saying too in our times that the law of progress be allowed to hold true in theology as in other departments of thought. Unquestionably knowledge is growing and growing very rapidly. There is no department of human inquiry of which that is not true. The literatures of the past are ransacked and languages are studied with more thorough and critical methods. The primitive forms of society, early civilization, and uncivilization, manners and want of manners, customs that are barbarous and customs that are venerable are all brought to the surface and keenly studied, with a view to finding out whether human society, follows any law of growth, and if so, what that law is. The same is true—still more emphatically true—of outward nature. Our knowledge of natural science is expanding every day. Chemistry, geology, botany, the theories of heat, of electricity, of magnetism, are passing constantly into new forms. Men who have reached middle life have had to unlearn and learn again a great deal of the physical science of college days. This is not a matter for sorrow. It is well that the human mind should be kept in movement, and that it should make every fragment of new knowledge an instrument of further progress.

But the pursuit of theological studies, in a time such as this especially, is liable to false progress as well as true. Foolish men sometimes think they are getting forward when they are only gyrating about in mere childish restlessness and impatience of established beliefs. We would not stay or check or turn from its course by any priestly incantations, or prophetic denunciations, or parliamentary edicts the intense intellectual activity of to-day. We may be shocked at times by what seems to us to be its audacity and irreverence in disregarding what we may consider sacred and authentic, nevertheless we want no chamber of torture, no new Index Expurgatorius. Truth is capable of its own vindication. We wish the doubter to speak out his doubt without disguise and without fear of hindrance. We shall then know where the defences of truth are weak, and what evidence is yet to be supplied or supplemented. It is not our office to invoke fire from heaven upon all who do not follow with us. Drifts of thought cannot be stopped or changed by dams and breakwaters of mechanical appliances of any kind, but only by counter drifts of higher origin and stronger current. Only this precaution would I utter regarding distinctively theological pursuits and truth, that there are some things in this world to be credited with the attribute of stability—some things that modern thought in its effective currents, the resultant trend of its great movements, and the mighty undertow that is bearing our institutions of society and possibly our whole civilization toward some new center, has left untouched and unchanged because they are unchangeable.

Men will never be cured of believing too little by unscrupulous attempts to involve them in believing too much, but in a time like ours they are very liable to wander into the vague and doubtful ways through unauthorized claims in behalf of alleged progress and thought neither of which is either progressive or thoughtful. I do not fear that either an atheistical agnosticism, a dogmatic atheism or a perverted and nerveless liberalism, is destined to establish itself upon the ruins of the Church of Christ. The danger is not on that line but rather in this, that before such systems are smitten by the sword of sound argu-

ment and ignominiously driven forth by the revolt against them of man's higher feelings, they may do much harm to unstable souls.

In such a time unbelief is likely to take on the forms of fadism. Shallow people fall to casting doubt on established truths and call it intellectual superiority. Rejecting the historic religion of the inspired Scriptures, the incarnation, the atonement the resurrection, they are prepared to adopt every notion that comes along—theosophy, hypnotism, thought-force, faith-cure, mind-cure, divine-healing, Christian science, and other religious vagaries—or they will presume to do the impossible task of nominally holding on to their Christian profession, but explaining away the accepted meaning of fundamental doctrines, emptying revealed truths of all their power, and so of all their practical value, invariably making their religion subservient to their accepted theory, and finally standing for St. Paul's portrayal in his warning to Timothy: "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth and shall be turned unto fables."

Popular skepticism is a very multifarious and wholesale thing. Ours is an age of secular doubt, and doubtless the Church has felt more deeply than it has yet confessed the age pervading chill of a winter of doubt and discontent. If I were called to characterize the age in much of its thinking I should say, that it was in bondage to its own doubt, and enslaved by its own denial.

Perforce of the spirit of the age we encounter in much of the religious life of our times what St. Paul encountered at Corinth. There is much of intellectual keenness and dialectic subtlety, a a wide discursive knowledge of philosophic thought, and of science both true and "falsely so-called," much pretentiousness in literary and aesthetic culture, a broad eclecticism in religious systems, and a professed readiness to receive what is good in all, as standing upon a common level, and at the same time a real superficiality of knowlege in all branches, an instability commensurate with the general versatility, an esteem of truth

as only what each one troweth, self-will as a determining principle, an enthronement in much theological thought of what President Patton has felicitously called "that compound of Hegel and Schleiermacher, called the Christian consciousness."

We have come upon times distinguished by a curious jumble of theological apprehension in which many are not given to discrimination. We have positive and negative, evangelical and rationalistic, subjective and objective aspects of truth and untruth, scriptural and evolutionary, orthodox and heretical tendencies. A distinctively evangelical theology is pressed hard by this spirit of the age. The old time reverence for her metes and bounds is questioned, rationalistic marauders do not hesitate to invade her territory, and claim her precious teachings as legitimate prey for their critical methods. The critical spirit of the times, especially in its handling of the Old Testament, has shown itself not conciliatory, but in its excess and arrogance it is wont to be pragmatic and impertinent. We seem sometimes to be back, not as has been said in the times of the Reformation, but in the days of Paul, when the gospel was beleaguered by Pharasaic formalism and Greek scorn, sacerdotal assumption and rationalistic contempt. Much of the religious thinking of our times is in accord with the position of Mr. Lecky, the author of "European Morals," that the elements of recuperation are in man himself, and that Christianity is only one stage in the progress of the race, and that it will ultimately be outgrown and give place to a higher and more "unclouded light." We have come to a real theological crisis. Against evangelicalism in the past has come the leagued hosts of heathenism, of Rome, of infidelity, of hate, of perverted learning, and the sins of her own wayward children. She is confronted in this new crisis by a perverted liberalism, an indefinable latitudinarianism. This insidious enemy is sapping and mining at her walls, encompassing her with trenches, trying her bastions and pounding away at her parapets.

That you may know that I have not mistaken the age spirit in some of its theological aspects, allow me to adduce an example or two of characteristic teaching. One of the very plain claims of Christianity is this, that it is an exclusive and absolute re-

ligion. As such it can admit of no compromise with other religious faiths, for it stands upon an entirely different basis from them all. Other religions display the gropings of the human mind after God, Christianity is the revelation of God to man. The radical distinction between all man-made religions on the one side, and Christianity on the other, is that the first are human philosophy, or a meditation upon God, while the second is a divine life, wherein Jesus Christ gives to those who believe on his name power to become sons of God. Alongside of these high claims let me place the teaching of a recent volume of the Bampton lectures. Speaking in behalf of the theory that Christianity must comprehend what is beautiful and true and good in other religions, Canon Freemantle says: "What sometimes appears to be non-Christian virtue, is really a stunted, perhaps a perverted, form of Christian virtue. The ideal of life presented by Sakya Muni, or by Mahomet, or again by Plato, or by Marcus Aurelius, or in the later centuries by Lorenzo de Medici, or by Gœthe, must partly be made to combine with our present Christian morality, partly be purified by it, partly be allowed to amplify our idea of what is morally good and Christian. If the word of God is the light of men everywhere, then it follows that all moral truth is essentially Christian truth and all true goodness Christian goodness." The meaning of this teaching is clear enough. It is this: the law of evolution holds good in both natural and spiritual worlds. The physical evolution of nature up to man is being followed by a spiritual evolution of man up to God. The test of Christianity as a universal religion, lies in its power not of dominating and absorbing these other religions, but of being assimilated by them. Here is naturalism pure and simple.

In an article on "The Need of a New Theology" in the *American Journal of Theology*, the successor of Henry Ward Beecher in Plymouth pulpit has recently said: "We are coming to see that there is no distinction between the supernatural and the natural; that the natural is all supernatural, and that the supernatural is all most natural.

Miracles are, therefore, no longer regarded by intelligent schol

ars as violations of the laws of nature. In a word the immanence of God is coming to be recognized as the fundamental fact in the new theology,—God in everything; all power belonging unto him: all phenomena, save only those of human sinfulness, manifestations of him." Here is a broad assumption that there is no distinction between the natural and supernatural. These transcendentalisms are not accepted by sound religious thought, 'tis true, but their persistent and widespread assertion means much.

These are not isolated examples of much that is current in theological teaching. The exigencies of this current liberalism have led some of its advocates to impose upon some of the most familiar terms of evangelcalism, such as "atonement," and "remission of sins," an alien meaning and a sense foreign to all the uses of language. They have imposed upon the language of Christ and his apostles an interpretation which the language never was intended to convey. Such familiar theological words as God, immortality, revelation and Trinity have been made to convey totally indefinite ideas or no ideas at all. Indeed a school has grown up in this country, known abroad from its most distinguished representative as Ritschlianism, and participated in, we may believe, by many who never heard of Albrecht Ritschl, which disavows definition altogether and desires to substitute for it mere feeling. The teaching of this school is to this effect that definitions are not to be regarded as a trellis on which the vine climbs, but rather as tightening bands to repress all growth of the vine. Accordingly religious teachers long and loud are talking about the modern conception of God that is larger; of an immortality that is less sensuous; of a revelation that is more world-wide and vital; of a Trinity that is more consonant with the supreme fact of eternal unity in the universe; of an atonement that is more full of ethical inspiration. This specious theological phraseology has increased in volume until recently even Dr Lyman Abbott's theologically liberal *Outlook* has said: "The theological positivism of the past is giving place to a spiritual vagueness in the present, which is sometimes as much too vague as the former was too defined."

There are those who feel that religious thought, as indicated in much of the theological discussion of the times, is drifting as De Quincey would say, down to the Botany Bay of the universe. The alarm, however, is groundless. As the human race cannot change its nature or stop its thinking, neither can it drift permanently into any such teaching if it would. There is a stubborn sentiment abroad in this world that what fits man's moral nature and saves him from his sins is not going to be overthrown by infidel crowing or Christian weeping. Let us not commit the mistake, which is so common, of thinking that the worst of all ages is our own age, which means only this that we live in this age and have not been called on to live in another. The signs are encouraging and vast progress is being made in the establishment of the evangelical faith. It is conquering the intellect of man in spite of himself. True science is now theistic. Agnosticism, the latest phase of unbelief, is a concession. That incorrigible nescience which finds no God in the universe or in human history, and which leaves no trace of the souls immortality, except possibly in the evanescent memory of its earthly survivors and in its imponderable and undistinguishable influences over them—that finds but few advocates among cultivated people.

Unbelief now-a-days is buttressed far more by natural depravity than by natural science. Even rationalism itself, to the negations of which I have just alluded, is in a sense a result of the leaven of the gospel. Of course the old positions of unbelief are not abandoned. There are still people who do valiantly in battle for exploded theories and vanquished heresies in both science and religion. Such facts as I have adduced indicate clearly that the chief point of rationalistic attack to-day is the supernatural. New names and new methods and new combinations of forces are led to the field but the same purpose animates them all—to eliminate the supernatural factor from religion and find some principle which will meet the needs of man and the conditions of the universe without it. In the theological crisis of our times the battle for evangelicalism against the insidious and specious new rationalism, is on. The trials of the Church have thus assumed a new form. We have no open persecution to fear as when

"Diocletian's fiery sword
Worked busy as the lightning."

Possibly no time has ever been more favorable for giving what is called fair play to the Church. Rome in olden days tolerated everything but Christianity; our age seems to be tolerant of about everything in the name of Christianity. "We have not only given up burning men for their opinions," said the late archbishop of York, "but we have also given up thinking that there are any opinions worth burning or being burnt for." The times are peaceful, the flock secure, the duties of the shepherd plain, and yet there are dangers. A tide of rationalistic thought as in the last century, has been rising. Other tides have been like the eruption of Vesuvius, fierce and terrible but moving slowly and confined in narrow space. The viscous flood of fire has wrapt round tree and homestead and made them ashes. This flood is like the tide of the great sea, that penetrates every part; undermining the children's castle on the sand and flowing into every stone of the pier, and taking invisible tribute from the cliff, so that no particle that is below sea-level can escape the insidious contact. This new flood of rationalism that is rising will leave no inch dry. That which is soluble will dissolve and only that which is above the water-floods will entirely escape its effects.

This new rationalism which I have thus endeavored to indicate, has several well-known and clearly defined characteristics. First, it changes the emphasis from the deity of Christ to the personal worth of Christ; second, it changes the emphasis from the death of Christ to the teaching of Christ; third, it changes the emphasis from the supernatural to the natural; and, fourth, it changes the emphasis from the authority of the Bible to the authority of the Christian consciousness.

The question now recurs, how is this situation to be met by the Church and Christian teachers? In this contemporary loosening of the grip upon the supernatural the pulpit in many places has dropped down to the level of the platform. Some preachers have made the attempt to doctor the symptoms of the Church's ailments empirically and in an emotional and intermit-

tent sort of a way, instead of dealing scientifically with the disease itself by radical and constitutional treatment. Passing phases of thought have been elaborated into abnormal importance, and accordingly a part of the ministry has proceeded upon the assumption that the chief function of the pulpit was to defend Christianity against the Darwins, and Tyndalls and Spencers and other high priests of agnostic ignorance and critical presumption. In the secularizing and rationalistic tendencies of our times, it is a grave question whether a good part of the Church has not allowed her great cardinal doctrines to be pushed into the shade. As the enlarged experience which sheds increased light on the various truths of revelation not seldom runs parallel with the rise of new errors, the pulpit is called above all things else to do one thing—to set over against the negative side of error a foreground filled with positive truth.

The preaching then I take it, for our theological crisis, will consist in a revival of doctrinal preaching, a renewal, if you please, in the good sense of the word, of pulpit dogmatism. Believe me, men and brethren, there is no message, no witness, no example which the Church of God so sorely needs to-day as a revival in the pulpit of the really great themes of the Christian religion. There is need of a stiff evangelical interpretation of the Gospel which shall meet the real wants of man's nature. The age needs pre-eminently in its pulpit preachers, not lecturers; a gospel and not a philosophy; a message from heaven and not a scheme earth-evolved; a real message of hope and glad tidings of no dubious sound. The dangers from half belief are greater than from disbelief, because disbelief is frequently honest while half-belief never is, and cannot be. The preaching of that which is an ultimate fact in religion, of that which is pre-eminent in Christian thought, and everlasting in Christian belief has always begotten in the Church a better intellectual sanitation and a robuster character. Anything less on the part of the preacher than down-right loyalty to the absolute truth of Jesus Christ, handicaps faith, gives skeptical thought an immense advantage, manufactures obstacles to its own success and creates the forces that ultimately make its progress impossible. Preach-

ing is distinctively an ordinance of Christianity. It is not a sort of autocratic dogmatism, such as may have been pardonable when the clergy constituted the only learned profession. The occupant of a Christian pulpit is not called to decide ex cathedra, and with limitless pretentiousness on every new scientific discovery or critical hypothesis. The commission of the Head of the Church is this, "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Comprehensive as this commission is it excludes a great many topics of popular interest. Science, literary criticism, politics, have their place in the curriculum of a universal learning, but that place is not in the pulpit.

The world needs the great remedy God has provided for the world's woes. When the world by human wisdom and philosophy knew not God, and was sunken in moral ignorance and sin, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save such as believed. The divine economy is still the true economy. Redemption is not of men but of God. Men are called to proclaim a definite message and to avoid profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so-called. There are scientific, historical, philosophical and sociological themes proper enough in their places, but these may all be accepted or rejected without affecting a man's salvation: but the work of the Christian pulpit is always and everywhere a restricted work, viz.: to proclaim the history of redemption, the true philosophy of salvation. When the accredited ambassador speaks the message of his commission, the king speaks. If the prophet of today would speak with a voice which is like the sound of many waters, he must speak in positive tones.

If there is any one thing more needed than another at this moment, it is this—on the part of preachers,—the habit of absolutely unquestioning submission to the authority of Christ as a teacher sent from God. There is not a single mischievous tendency of the times in religion that would not be corrected by this habit. The teacher of religion is not so much to define God, as to proclaim him, not so much to furnish a complete and

systematic philosophy of the universe, as to be a herald of the incarnate God. To imagine that we can adapt our preaching the better to the age and its demands by weakening, concealing or abandoning the truth of its characteristic features, is to mistake the great need of the times. I take it therefore that the most urgent ministerial duty of the day is the reassertion of the great doctrines of the gospel with a new definiteness and earnestness. Until they are thus restored to their true place in the teaching and thought and life of some churches, the life of those churches will continue to be impoverished and their foundations unstable. Some great and vital truths have been relegated to obscurity and silence, if they have not been consciously and avowedly rejected. What we need therefore in the crises of which I have spoken, is a real revival of pulpit positivism.

In an article of so recent date as March 25th of this present year, Ian Maclaren has this to say: "We stand aghast at the mental attitude of our fathers who allowed no open questions, comprehending everything from the origins to the end of time and casting good men out for heresy on subjects about which no man could know anything." * * "We congratulate ourselves on our tolerance, and we do well, provided that it arises from modesty about mysteries or charity toward our fellow-men; but we do far from well if we are tolerant simply because we do not think there is any certainty possible in religion, or because we have no convictions to rouse our spirit. Preachers are affected by the atmosphere, and this to-day is anti-supernatural, so that without being conscious that their faith has been weakened, they come to state truth in terms of worldly wisdom. The personal God of the saints becomes the eternal something or other; He who was dead and is alive forevermore fades into the Christ idea; and immortality is to be taken as being saved from incredibility by the perpetually hopeful papers of the Psychical Society. One fears that in some quarters the pulpit has lost nerve. It may be that our fathers were too certain about everything; it would be an immense gain if some of us were absolutely sure about anything." This is sound teaching from what some would regard as an unexpected source. The

preacher must have a principle, an impulse, a line of action which will carry him beyond the negative result of making unbelief doubtful to the positive result of making belief credible. The only way in which the Church can hope to deal with negativism must be the strong and intelligent building up of faith, and the sooner that any minister can be convinced that it is not a special department of his pulpit work, to be undertaken with distinct preparation and with special effort, to tell men what *not* to believe, apart from his general work of preaching a positive gospel, the better for him and his work and his people. "The pulpit must be positive," said that great soul and true prophet, the late Phillips Brooks, "telling its message, trusting to the power of that message, expecting to see it blend into harmony with all other truth that fills the world; and the preacher, whatever else he may be elsewhere, in the pulpit must be positive, uttering truth far more than denying error."

The age can find no joy in the kingdom of heaven unless it finds there a source of authority to command the belief of the mind as well as the feeling of the heart. Not by any cheap personal magnetism are men to be charmed out of doubting into believing. Nothing but the eternal truth of God can meet the always shifting and yet always identical error and unbelief of man. The man who is preaching truth is thereby confuting error. Explicit and unflinching statement affords the best chance to correct an error, or to make the truth useful.

There is a popular condemnation of doctrinal preaching and a popular commendation of alleged practical preaching. Both are true or false according as they are interpreted. All preaching should be both doctrinal and practical. It should have a profound truth in it but a sharp edge on it. A doctrinal sermon without an object is like an unloaded rifle, and a practical application without a profound truth behind it, is like a gatling gun with no powder behind the bullets. I know that doctrinal preaching has sometimes been like unto a lecture on the science and art of bread making, instead of actually ministering bread to hungry men. You cannot have a sermon that is a sermon

without doctrine in it any more than you can have a loaf of bread without flour in it. It is good for us now and then to come back to the recollection, that while there are a thousand applications of the truth, and it may be stated in an endless variety of ways, yet that at bottom there are a few old things to which we must continually recur, and the substance of which must be found in everything we say. To the unperverted mind these old things are always fresh and new. To the taste that is not vitiated, simple bread never loses it charm and sparkling water is sweeter and more refreshing than the rarest vintages of the Rhine. The value of sound doctrine is not quoted in the markets of the world and accordingly thousands dominated by entirely secular views of life, remain insensible of its value. Unbelief has its interpretation, its philosophy of human existence. So likewise man has a capacity for fellowship with the infinite, and there is a true philosophy of the religious life. Its principles are enunciated in the Gospel of our Lord. It is with the moral character of God, the moral order of the world, the moral condition and hope of man, the moral nature of his own mission and the moral effect in history of his own career, that the mind of Christ is incessantly and absorbingly occupied, and about his teaching on all these subjects there is a pronounced pragmatic element. Nine and forty times in the brief and fragmentary record of the discourses of Jesus recurs this solemn phrase with which he authenticates his doctrine—"Verily I say unto you." Certain great truths are vital to the Gospel of the incarnation. Christ declared certain great doctrines, and if we deny them, or make them uncertain, the life which was built upon them has no meaning, no substance and no power. The defect in much cotemporary pulpit work, lies not in the lack of rational argument in behalf of the great evangelical doctrines, but in the doubt and hesitation upon the lips of some men who have been set apart to proclaim them. The unbelief of thousands is due to ignorance of what the great doctrines of Christianity really are. It is the chief function of the Christian preacher to present those elements of recuperation that do not appear in man himself. It is only with a background of atonement, and a Gospel of free

grace that repentance can avail. But there is no atonement or grace in a minimized gospel. Every heresy and perversion in the history of the Church has been vanquished and corrected by the revival of some great commanding doctrine. Augustine met the Pelagian heresy with the Epistle to the Romans, the stiffest doctrinal treatise of the New Testament. Luther met a false conception of works with the doctrine of faith. Wesley pierced the shadows of traditional formalism with the cry—"Ye must be born again." If I am not mistaken we are confronted to-day in much of the church's life, with a feeble and defective sense of the moral government of God, and a decayed sense of the guilt of sin. We need accordingly a reassertion of the nature and reality of the divine government, the great fact that God administers a real Government which will neither wrong the innocent nor clear the guilty; a government in which each moral agent will have the place in eternity which he ought to have, viz.: his own place; a government which implies a judgment to come and an actual penalty for incorrigible subjects. This great truth which pervades the word of God needs a new emphasis to-day. It will have to be restored to a more prominent place in the preaching of the pulpit before any profound awakening will take place. Men are not to be delivered from a blind and dazed infatuation of selfishness and luxurious life, by the droning of pater-nosters, the setting up of bland analogies or some sweet story of the development of life.

And what is true of this doctrine is equally true of all the really great truths of religion. They must have a larger place in the message of the pulpit. Preachers are *ex officio* guardians of Christian doctrine. They are to claim the leadership of popular discussion upon the great themes of religion, and to show by their mastery of the subject their ability and, therefore, their right to hold that leadership. Never should a revival of popular inquiry upon a Christian doctrine be allowed to come to a head in any reconstruction of opinion without the wise and winning voice of the pulpit. We who are called to preach are under the most solemn obligation to make known to others whatever God has revealed concerning the condition and destiny

of our race. We are not to plead an invincible reluctance to speak them because they are too awful and unfathomable for our plummet lines, even in our silent and solitary thought. We are bound to tell men the real facts and doctrines of evangelicalism, concealing nothing and minimizing nothing. Christ himself is responsible for the revelation he has made to our race. To improve upon it, to suppress what we think is likely to provoke resentment, to insist upon what we think will conciliate, is no part of our duty. The legitimate apostolic succession is not that which insists upon an original donation of grace, communicated from age to age by the formal touch of certain ecclesiastical persons, but that which has consistently maintained apostolic doctrine. The true minister is not a priest; he does not stand between God and man to mediate between them; he is not called to offer up sacrifices, or to be the dispenser of a grace exclusively committed to him. He is the successor of the prophetic rather than the priestly order. He is a called and set apart teacher of divine truth. The holy place in his church is the case which holds the sacred scroll. His instrument is not a sacrifice but the truth of God. "To be God's mouthpiece when God is not speaking through him," says the Rev. Robert F. Horton, "is a fraud of the palpable kind which men will not away with" * * * "All manner of sins may be forgiven a preacher—a harsh voice, a clumsy delivery, a bad pronunciation, an insufficient scholarship, a crude doctrine, an ignorance of men; but there is one defect which cannot be forgiven, for it is a kind of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost—it cannot be forgiven him if he preaches when he has not received a message from God."

"All around the circle of human doubt and despair, where men and women are going out to enlighten and uplift and comfort and strengthen their fellow men under the perplexities and burdens of life," says the author of "The Gospel for an Age of Doubt," "we hear the cry for a gospel which shall be divine, and therefore sovereign and unquestionable and sure and victorious."

Preaching such great vitalizing doctrines the preacher can stand on the power of God rather than on the natural effects of

human causation. What church history sufficiently verifies is this that without an ample witness to such truths as the Trinity, the atonement, the person and work of Christ, and the supremacy of the divine word, no blessing can be expected on the ministry of any church. "The boastful shouts of error," says Dr. Henry Van Dyke, "have been the advertisements of the silent truth. Error has had kings and generals, philosophers and orators, empires and armies; truth has had God. Error has had swords and spears, ships and cannon, fortresses and dungeons, racks and fires; but truth has had God." No other subjects than such as are included in the great doctrines of the gospel can be sure of commanding the coöperation of the third person of the adorable Trinity. Philosophy, poetry, art, literature, and sociology are attractive subjects to many minds, and they who handle such themes in the pulpit may set them forth with alluring words of human genius, but there is no certainty that the Holy Ghost will accompany their presentation with his divine attestation. It ought therefore to be the supreme question with the preacher, what themes can assuredly command the witness of the Spirit rather than what topics will enlist itching ears.

No doubt there has been a reaction from the scholastic forms in which certain Christian doctrines were presented while the influence of rationalism was strongly felt, but signs multiply that theology, in the pulpit and out, is again going to vindicate its claim to be considered as an essential factor even in man's intellectual life. It will adapt itself to changed conditions but the revival will come. "Theologians may console themselves," says the author of the 'Cure of Souls', "with the reflection that all the railing and girding at doctrine is simply one of the innumerable forms of modern cant, and that theology is an absolute necessity." That eccentric historian and romanticist Renan made a strange remark not long before his death: "I fear," said he, "that the work of the twentieth century will consist in taking out of the waste-basket a multitude of excellent ideas which the nineteenth century has heedlessly thrown into it." The skeptic's fear is the believer's hope, and it would not be a strange issue indeed of such times as ours, if out of them there should come early in the twentieth century a great demand for a revival of

the preaching of the great doctrines, such as the Trinity, the atonement, and kindred majestic and dignified themes. Already we may see the Renaissance of dogmatics in the recent publication of such books as Harris' "Self Revelation of God;" Fairbairn's "Place of Christ in Modern Theology;" Scott's "Nicene Theology;" Stearns' "Present Day Theology," and "Evidence of Christian Experience," and Jacobs' "Elements of Religion." These and innumerable other books, both small and great, as well as the magazines, not distinctly of the theological order, indicate that the revival has really come.

But some men want doctrinal preaching they say, but with the strenuous demand that it be set forth according to "the spirit of the age." In this demand is truth and likewise the possibility of error. All theology is progressive, and we can as we go back along the line of the Christian ages, stop at the successive points of time when the present accepted doctrines of the Church, one after another, reached a definite form. In the history of our religion Scripture is original; systems of doctrine are derivative. Dr. Philip Schaff has said, "Every age must produce its own theology, adapted to its peculiar condition and wants," while one of the best accredited scholars of our own Church, Prof. Henry E. Jacobs, has said, "As with our sermons, so it must also be with our theology; we cannot depend upon translations, except as merely temporary expedients. The matter remains permanent; but the form changes not only with the language, but with the age, the currents of thought and the diverse classes of errors and attacks that succeed one another with great rapidity. We must speak the language of the time and place where Providence has placed us." The adaptation must thus be in such incidents as language and not in any change in the substance of Christian doctrine. New meanings are constantly coming out of the teaching of Jesus in every age and in every land. It is not that each succeeding century and race adds something of its own to the doctrines of the gospel, but this rather. that each finds in that source something which was meant to become its own, and so to satisfy its deepest needs. New approaches demand new defences, and perhaps if we were called upon to make a statement of doctrine adapted

to meet the battle-front of to-day, we could and would profitably dismount some artillery that has been used to defend the logical relations of God's thoughts and purposes in a past eternity, and carry it around to that side of the fortress where the ground shakes with new assaults. There is such a thing as continuity in the Christian doctrines. Tradition is bad, but mere iconoclastic anti-traditionalism is not much better. The Bible has a meaning and that meaning can be discovered by impartial, inductive research, just as well as can the laws of nature. No criticism which is not stone blind can get out of the New Testament any other doctrine than that of the evangelical faith. Augustine and Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Tertullian, Luther and Calvin were not fools but great men, and he who fails to recognize that fact is himself guilty of insensate and preposterous folly. Theology itself is our thoughts of God, our beliefs concerning Christ, our knowledge of the Bible. It is clear enough that God does not change, nor the gospel of his love, nor can the record in which that gospel is enshrined. It is not necessarily a narrow-minded function to stand for old doctrines but rather a high function of stewardship and defence. The experience of one thousand eight hundred years has proved that the world needs no new and modified gospel of adjustment. What then does the modern pulpit need? Just what the old pulpit wanted—a sense of the sinfulness of man and the remedial forces provided for it, and as well attested as amply provided. The old doctrines fit the spiritual needs of this century as closely as they fitted the same needs of the first. They carry the same attractions and credentials in the western hemisphere as at first in the eastern. The best preaching for the times is the preaching for all times. The work of the Christian preacher therefore is not to map out the surface currents of the ocean but to give his time to deep sea soundings. He cannot afford to be merely the student of the earth's gravel and drift, the debris of ransacked glaciers and the flotsam of lost rivers, but it is his office to go down into the granitic and azoic heart of the great doctrines of the gospel, and when he turns aside from these legiti-

mate themes of pulpit discourse to make the shifting events of the day the staple of his discourse he betrays his office and understands neither his duties nor the needs of his age. The molds and forms of the gospel, the incidents not essential to its validity may change; but *the* gospel the *only* gospel, disentangled from all human speculations, the gospel which Paul carried from Asia into Europe, the great message that God is in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, that gospel is a positive, a definite, a dogmatic gospel that admits of no abridgment and is wanted for all ages wherein men sin and suffer and thirst after righteousness.

Even the concessions of liberalists bear testimony to the necessity of declaring unto men virile beliefs. Unitarianism shall not likely see a higher authority in our times than James Martineau, and this was his frank confession touching the huskiness of Unitarian theology, literature and philosophy as food for souls,—"I am constrained to say that neither my intellectual preference nor my moral admiration goes heartily with the Unitarian heroes, sects or productions of any age. Ebionites, Arians, Socinians all seem to me to contrast unfavorably with their opponents. I am conscious that my deepest obligations as a learner from others are in almost every department to writers not of my own creed." Again, listen to Thos. Starr King, one of the most eloquent, candid, and popular of the champions of Socinianism in this century. In a glowing passage on the evangelical doctrine of an expiatory atonement he says: "It is ennobled by the holiest memories, as it has been consecrated by the loftiest talent of Christendom. It fired the fierce eloquence of Tertullian in the early church, and gushed in honeyed period from the lips of Chrysostom; it enlisted the life-long zeal of Athanasius to keep it pure; the sublimity of it fired every power and commanded all the resources of the mighty soul of Augustine; the learning of Jerome and the energy of Ambrose were committed to its defense; it was the text for the subtle eye and the analytic thought of Aquinas; it was the pillar of Luther's great soul toiling for man; it was shaven into intellectual and systematic symmetry by the iron logic of John Calvin; it

inspired the beautiful humility of Fenelon, fostered the devotion and self-sacrifice of Oberlin; flowed like molten metal into the rigid forms of Edward's intellect and kindled the deep and steady rapture of Wesley's heart. * * All the great enterprises of Christian history have been born from the influence, immediate or remote, which this vicarious theory of redemption has exercised upon the mind and heart of humanity." Could confirmation of what I have said be stronger in a time when much of popular literature seems surcharged with attacks on "Intellectualism" and "Dogmatism," and glowing with highly colored portrayals of "good Christians" of every name and no name, of every faith and no faith, under each of which stands the legend written that since good Christians arise under every form of faith or no faith alike, it cannot be a matter of much importance what men believe; that the highest intellectual achievement is to believe nothing, and that to believe anything earnestly and vigorously is an infallible sign of intellectual weakness. Such teaching of an emasculated religiousness will train, not strong men for the kingdom, but a generation conforming to Marheineke's characterization of Paulas, a representative of the older or so-called "vulgar" rationalism, as one "who believes that he thinks and thinks that he believes, but was incapable of either."

And you will permit me on this denominational occasion to express my growing appreciation and conviction of the scripruralness, adaptability and utility of that particular apprehension of doctrine known in the history of the Church as Lutheranism. It has no characteristic feature that we could improve by alteration. It contains those elements of efficiency which in times past have proved to be the power of God, and to contain those strong features of evangelicalism, in contradistinction with rationalistic negation and Romanistic legalism and pretentiousness, which have gladdened the world. Our faith has been of vast blessing to this world and we need not fear that it will fail of the same result in time to come. This is an age of progress. Let us progress in an intelligent appreciation of the significance of our past history and of the promise of the future which it

embodies. Let us progress, not by changing a system which has been baptized by the unction of the Holy Ghost; but let us progress by utilizing the truth for which we stand in all holy activities, in all Christian work, and in our love for souls for whom Christ died, and in the intelligence and ardor of our zeal for the glory of God and for the cause and kingdom of Jesus Christ. What God did in the time past for and through our fathers is but the type and promise of what he will do for us now. The historian Sallust tells us that the Roman mothers trained their children in the presence of the busts and statues of their ancestors. We should train our rising ministry, as it were in the presence of their forefathers in the faith, and urge them as the Roman mothers did, to be inspired and strengthened by the fact that they are to serve in a Church holding fast to truths which the world needs and to which they are to bear witness, only adapting themselves to the ever-varying circumstances of the changing ages. We have a creed of positive doctrines, including the best parts of the traditional orthodoxy, without going into interminable details, while at the same time guarding against all possible dangerous implications. The great confession of 1530 is such a creed as that. It is comprehensive, satisfactory, and as a doctrinal basis is sound and ample enough and needs neither revision nor addition.

In the light of these truths, fathers and brethren, it shall be my high aim to deepen the sense of what a privilege it is to be a minister of Christ's Gospel at this particular time. We need a learned and thoughtful ministry,—watchmen alert, instructed and able to meet the peculiar demands of a theological crisis; men who can think, who are passionately religious, skilled in the theology, and withal acquainted with contemporary problems. Preachers must be trained not only to trust the truth but likewise to know where and how to apply that truth. It is the high function of a theological school to teach young men from the first that their business is to find out what is true for their particular message, and then declare it to the world in its completeness with all the lunge and earnestness of profound conviction. We need men of trained endowments of mind to make

the really great truths of religion real and plain—men whose scholarship is like a plate glass window, protecting and yet revealing the great doctrines of the divine and infallible word. Intellectual discipline, spiritual power, Biblical scholarship are the three needs of the preacher. If the spirit of the Lord and the mind of the Son of Man united to make a preacher in the Nazareth synagogue, it is surely not too much to demand in our time the vital union of trained mental powers and the spirit of the Lord in the noblest work man ever gave himself unto, the study of God's thoughts, in human terms for human needs. If the pulpit has lost power, absolutely or comparatively, it is because the men in the pulpit have neglected one of these three conditions of power. If, as the critics of the pulpit say, preachers were once mightier than they are now, it is because they thought more. When the mind is neglected, goes about in dressing gown and slippers, spends its hours in the easy chair rather than in the gymnasium, the preacher becomes a pigmy in a theological crisis. What we need is a revival of Christian theology in the Christian pulpit.

That young man who is looking to the ministry as his life calling and proceeds upon the assumption that men are not interested in theology, is unfitted for the kingdom at this time, and before he starts. As another has said: "Every platform speech is seasoned with the theological controversy of the hour. Boys sell tracts and sermons along with the journals of the day. Doctrinal novelettes shine in the monthly magazines and stately symposia sit in the solemn banquet chambers of the quarterlies." When ministers shall pursue theological studies as Melanchthon says he did, for personal spiritual benefit; when theological science shall be wrought into the very soul, inducing a theological mood; when through learning, and diligent self-discipline, shall go hand in hand with deep love for God and souls, we have a ministry of disciplined intellect, spiritual power, and Biblical scholarship, and such as is never wanting in power over men.

In the Vatican there is a celebrated fresco by Raphael in which the great master has put on record his conception of the

exalted character and the magnetic spell of theology. A beautiful woman, austere and chaste, with laurel intertwined in her hair, and with the gospels in her hand, points to the picture below, while two cherubs by her side hold up tablets containing these words "*Divinarum Rerum Notitia*"—"the knowledge of divine things." The painting deals with earth and heaven as a whole. A cloud divides the canvas into two halves. In the upper half the heavenly world is depicted. The Trinity is presented according to the symbolism customary at the time. Beneath the divided cloud which is suggestively broken through by the descending spirit and by some cherubs bearing the Holy Scriptures, the earthly assembly of believers is portrayed. Arranged right and left of another, where the eucharist is displayed and upon which the Holy Spirit is falling, a great company is seen. Jerome the diligent student of Scripture is there; and Ambrose the indefatigable Bishop of Milan; and Augustine the greatest of the fathers; and Bernard the mystic and preacher who directed the consciences of kings; and Gregory the exegete; Aquinas "the angelic doctor" and the systematizer; Boneventura "the seraphic doctor" and the Lord's biographer; Peter Lombard the master of sentences, and Scotus Erigena the master of arguments. It is the office of him who is called to the work upon which I have entered to introduce young men who aspire to be Christian teachers and pastors, to the goodly company of these and others who have wrought in that superb science which has to deal with God in the mystery of his being and the mercy of his doing, and with man in the majesty of his nature and the misery of his fall.

When Helena was searching at Jerusalem for the wood of the true cross, she arranged a line of beacons to the royal city of her son Constantine. Watchers waited by day and by night, each keenly observing his signal point. The dried wood and the resinous gums were heaped high and guarded well. At length to him who watched like Elijah upon Carmel, a distant light appeared. At first it seemed a star, then it grew into a glory, and then he, too, lit his torch and fired his beacon, and one beyond him caught it up, and that same evening all Con-

stantinople was ablaze with joy. Swiftly as ran that ancient flame from headland to headland, and from height to height, shall some day run the flash of a nobler triumph. In it each weary watcher shall have his part. In it each faithful pastor, each herald of a sound gospel, shall take his share. In it as the long flames leap up in every land, shall we at last behold that glory which shall nevermore grow dim on land or sea. I trust that I am fully conscious of the dignity, gravity and responsibility of him who is called to train young men in that practical theology which will make of them true heralds and watchful sentinels in this honored succession.

Mr. President, fathers and brethren, and friends of the seminary, in the professorship into which I am now inducted, I shall hope to create some enthusiasm for the highest of all studies and an intelligent devotion in the noblest of all callings. I feel that the spirit that should animate this hour is that of hope in the opportunity here offered for usefulness in the Master's service, confidence in the sympathy and coöperation of the constituency of our beloved institution. The position and principles of our seminary are no uncertain quantities. It stands for a broad sympathy with the interests of the universal kingdom of our Lord, for loyalty to the life of the body of Christians to which we belong, and for a consistent Lutheranism fairly and generously interpreted. We are at the gateway of two centuries. Behind us are the years of our fathers, around us in the heritage they have given us, before us is the land to be possessed. We regard with gratitude to God the heritage of our Church. We thank him for its beginning, its ecumenical progress and its hopeful present. We praise him for the faith of our fathers, as they set foot upon yonder ground and claimed it for a training school for the ministry. We praise him for the heritage of truth our Church has guarded and handed down to us, along with the memory of godly lives, steadfast faith and heroic labors. We accept reverently the responsibilities of our time and place.

With humility of spirit, and an acknowledgment of allegiance only to one Master, even Christ, and with the purpose to teach

his gospel with reverent boldness, in the difficult duty assigned me, I earnestly invite the sympathy, and the prayers of all who desire the perpetuation of a sound and scriptural ministry and who love the kingdom and wait for the coming of our one Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

ARTICLE IV.

JOHN WESLEY AND THE SALZBURGERS.

By Prof. A. G. Voigt, D. D.

It is a widespread opinion among the Lutherans of this country that John Wesley in his voyage to Georgia in 1736 was deeply impressed by the composure and religious serenity of Salzburgers, who were coming to this country at the same time; and so that great change in spirit which became so significant not only for Wesley individually, but for the whole world, is in some measure to be traced back to the Salzburgers. This opinion was expresssed in a recent article in the Lutheran Quarterly. It can be found in Dr. Wolf's "Lutherans in America" and in Dr. Jacobs' "History of the American Lutheran Church." It is quite fully maintained and defended in Strobel's "History of the Salzburgers."

Notwithstanding these eminent authorities, a reading of the first part of Wesley's Journal long ago convinced us that there was a misapprehension in this view, and a renewed examination of the sources of information has confirmed us in that conviction. These sources of information are two: Wesley's Journal and Urlsperger's Nachrichten Salzburgischer Emigranten. From these sources we think it can be shown that John Wesley was not influenced on his voyage in the manner described for three reasons: first, John Wesley was not in the same ship with the Salzburgers; second, the Salzburgers did not possess that passive spirit which characterized the people by whom Wesley was impressed; third, Wesley could not have confused Salzburgers with Moravians.

We proceed now to explain these reasons in detail.

First, John Wesley and the Salzburgers were not in the same ship. It was the third company of Salzburgers who came over in the expedition which brought John Wesley to Savannah. The Salzburgers were under the direction of *commissarius* Philip George Frederic von Reck, who kept a careful diary of the voyage in which he shows himself to have been an observant man. This diary may be found in Urlsperger's Nachrichten. From it we learn that he arrived in London on the 3rd of October, 1735, and his company of emigrants arrived the next day. On the 7th he received a land grant in Georgia of five hundred acres. On the 24th of October a part of the expedition, consisting of one hundred and fifty persons, English, French, German and Irish, embarked at London on the ship London Merchant, which set sail on the 28th. Von Reck says the ship of Gov. Oglethorpe, the Simonds, had set sail for Gravesend several days before. Now it is not absolutely impossible that the Salzburgers were separated and a part put on the Governor's vessel. But there is not the least probability that it was so. The company was not large (the precise figure we are not able to give), so that it could easily be accommodated on the one ship. It is not likely that when they were under the direction of von Reck they would be placed in another ship. But the decisive argument is that von Reck nowhere intimates that any of his Salzburgers were in the other ship, but speaks of them as being in the same ship with himself.

From the Journal of John Wesley we learn that he embarked on the Simmonds (so he spells the name) at Gravesend, on the 14th of October. Doubtless he used the old style calendar. Adding eleven days for correction, the date of his embarkation becomes October 25th. This corresponds with the dates given by von Reck. The expedition was made up of these two ships, which were afterwards joined at the Isle of Wight by a vessel of war as a convoy. Wesley says there were twenty-six Germans on his vessel. David Nitschmann was Bishop of the Germans. When he arrived at Savannah he associated with the

Germans, whose pastor was Spangenberg. It is evident that these Germans were Moravians. From Wesley's Journal we learn that there was a small colony of Moravians in Savannah. Doubtless Bishop Nitschmann conducted another company of Moravian colonists to join them. Wesley speaks of the Germans on his ship as if they were a unit, having their own regular services. Nor is it probable that so small a number as twenty-six should consist of a mixture of Moravians and Salzburgers. During a long delay at the Isle of Wight there was abundant opportunity for the passengers to visit the other ship and Wesley says such visits were made. Moreover, on one occasion in mid-ocean von Reck dined on the ship in which John Wesley was by invitation of Gov. Oglethorpe. Now if there had been anything in common between the Moravians and Salzburgers, or between the latter and Wesley, some intimation of it should appear in the Diary of von Reck, or the Journal of Wesley. But the latter makes not the slightest reference to Salzburgers in the part of his Journal which describes his voyage; and von Reck makes no allusion to the Moravians. The simple reason is they were in separate ships and there was nothing in common between them.

This circumstance, that the Salzburgers were not in the same vessel with Wesley, should settle the case as far as receiving impressions from them on board of the vessel is concerned. But there is another circumstance which tends to establish the same view. The Salzburgers did not possess that kind of a religious spirit which Wesley says impressed him. It was the quietism of the Moravians which affected Wesley. We think the diary of von Reck indicates that he and his party did not have that kind of a passive spirit. Wesley describes the character and conduct of the Germans on his ship as follows: "I had long before observed the great seriousness of their behaviour, of their humility they had given a continual proof, by performing those servile offices for the other passengers, which none of the English would undertake; for which they desired and would receive no pay, saying, 'It was good for their proud hearts' and 'their loving Saviour had done more for them.' And every day had

been given them occasion of showing a meekness, which no injury could move. If they were pushed, struck or thrown down, they rose again and went away; but no complaint was found in their mouth. There was now an opportunity of trying whether they were delivered from the spirit of fear, as well as from that of pride, anger, and revenge. In the midst of the psalm wherewith their service began, the sea broke over, split the main-sail in pieces, covered the ship, and poured in between the decks, as if the great deep had already swallowed us up. A terrible screaming began among the English. The Germans calmly sang on. I asked one of them afterwards, 'Was you not afraid?' He answered, 'I thank God, no.' I asked, 'But were not your women and children afraid?' He replied mildly, 'No; our women and children are not afraid to die.' "

Now this sort of quietistic passivity characterizes Moravians, but we would not expect to find it among Lutherans. We would rather expect a healthy human fear notwithstanding their trust in God. And in fact we find it was so. While the London Merchant was off Cowes waiting for a favorable wind, von Reck, his brother and a Herr von Hermsdorff went to shore in a boat. On their return they were overtaken by a storm which imperiled their lives. Von Reck describes the scene and his feelings as follows: "The darkness of the night and dense fog, the noise of the mighty wind, the roaring of the swelling and foaming waves, which at times struck us, the fatigue of our pilot, who had become quite exhausted by the rowing, the thought of so important a matter as going out of time into a blessed or unblessed eternity, the only moment which still seemed to be left to us in time, the needed assurance of grace and of the forgiveness of our sins in this life, all this doubled the natural fear in us and pressed from our anxious hearts fervent sighs for help and grace, which God also granted us in the midst of our anxiety. Finally we came so near to the ship that a rope could be thrown to us from it, which we seized and in this way were saved. As soon as we entered the cabin, we were not ashamed of throwing ourselves upon our knees before the Lord our God, in the presence of the English, as half-dead, to praise him and to con-

secrate to him the life granted to us for Christ's sake anew with most humble thanks. Oh my God! How did I and my companions feel at that time in our danger!"

Von Reck felt much as John Wesley says he felt during stormy weather, and this was very different from the passivity displayed by the Moravians whom Wesley so much admired.

But we are not left to inferences from the conduct of these three men on this occasion to judge that the attitude of the Salzburgers generally in a storm was not one of quiet passivity like that attributed to the Moravians by Wesley. Von Reck also gives an account of that very storm in which the English minister so admired the Germans. Wesley dates it Sunday the 25th of January. Eleven days added to correct the old style of calendar makes February the 5th. Von Reck dates it the night of the 5th and 6th. Wesley represents the worst as occurring from seven until twelve o'clock in the night. Besides, von Reck says that the main-sail of the Simonds was torn by a huge wave, a circumstance also mentioned by Wesley in the passage quoted above, in which we see the calm conduct of the Germans which so deeply impressed him. Now during that very storm the Salzburgers under the conduct of von Reck were much agitated. He says in his diary of their conduct in that storm: "In this danger we thought of the example of the ancients, that the Lord hears the cry of the distressed. We remembered his tender mercy, by which he never forsook us in any distress. It was our custom to gather daily for our edification; but to-day we were driven together by the storm. We ventured upon the word, "Call upon me in trouble." We approached the throne of grace with weeping and prayer, and in this manner appeared before the Father with our Advocate. Who for the sake of his dear Son could refuse us no petition. After the hour of prayer I betook myself to a dark cabin and went to bed, but on account of great anxiety from my sins, my evil conscience and unbelief I could not sleep. Every blow of the waves against the ship was a violent blow upon my heart, and I had nought to oppose to the violence of the waves and the fear of death but yearning sighs and hope of grace for Christ's sake."

We think from this weeping and anxiety it is evident that

these were not the people who impressed Wesley so peculiarly.

Finally we think it is impossible to conceive that Wesley did not know how to distinguish the Salzburgers from the Moravians. Mr. Strobel must have felt that the foundation of his argument was insecure. He felt there was a serious difficulty in the fact that Wesley mentions Moravians only, and not Salzburgers. We think the obvious reason for saying nothing about Salzburgers is that there were none in Wesley's ship and that Wesley knew it.

What are the probabilities in the case? Is it probable that an educated man like Wesley and one interested in religious matters, should have been ignorant of the most notorious fact in the religious history of the time? The heartless persecution of the Salzburgers had sent a thrill through all Europe. Could Wesley have taken no note of it, nor of the persons who were the interesting victims of this persecution, so that he could not tell them from Moravians? Is this at all conceivable, when he was in the service of the very company that was aiding these poor people and giving them homes in the very colony in which he was to labor himself? Wesley could not have been ignorant who the Salzburgers were.

But we have more than surmisings on this point. Wesley did not publish his Journal just as he wrote it. He edited it with omissions. Now if it were possible that he did not know how to distinguish Salzburgers from Moravians while he was on the ship, he certainly would not have continued that confusion after he learned to know who the Salzburgers really were. He would certainly have corrected the Journal if there had been need of correction. Both his Journal and Urlsperger's Nachrichten show an acquaintance of Wesley with the Salzburgers at a later time. In the latter, one of the letters of Bolzius, one of the pastors at Ebenezer, refers to a visit he made to John Wesley in Savannah, who, not being in the town at the time, had left a courteous letter for his visitor. In his Journal Wesley tells briefly of a visit to Ebenezer in 1737. He made this visit with August Spangenberg, the Moravian pastor in Savannah. He describes it in these words: "In the evening we came to New Ebenezer, where the poor Salzburgers are settled. The

industry of this people is quite surprising. Their sixty huts are neatly and regularly built, and all the little spots of ground between them improved to the best advantage. One side of the town is a field of Indian corn; on the other are the plantations of several private persons; all which together one would scarce think it possible for a handful of people to have done in one year.

Twelve years later, in 1749, he notes the receipt of a letter from Ebenezer in Georgia, written by John Martin Bolzius, which he published in part in his Journal. In the same connection he expresses regret that when he was at Savannah he refused to admit Bolzius to the Lord's table, because he had not been baptized by one episcopally ordained. In his letter Bolzius had written that 'the Lord had not permitted the Herrnhuters (falsely called Moravians), nor other false teachers, to creep in among us.' This remark greatly pleased Wesley for by this time his connection with the Moravians was broken. John Wesley well knew the difference between Salzburgers and Herrnhuters.

And he must have known the difference on the voyage. For he visited the London Merchant on which they sailed, and Commissarius Von Reck visited the Simonds, in which he made the voyage.

If there is any honor in having deeply impressed the already earnest spirit of John Wesley, we must accord it to the Moravians. The reputation of the Salzburgers for piety will suffer no injury by the correction of the widespread error discussed in this article.

ARTICLE V.

THE WORD OF GOD IN CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

[BAUGHER LECTURE ON CHRISTIAN WORSHIP IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, GETTYSBURG, PA., DELIVERED MAY 31, 1897.]

BY EDWARD T. HORN, D. D.

I appreciate the invitation to deliver the Baugher Lecture on Christian Worship. This foundation has contributed to an extension of true knowledge on this subject and is a promise of continued investigation and discussion. That the true principles of Christian worship are not universally discerned is shown by the very different types of worship which exist. That its history is not fairly studied by all, is proven by the contradictory theories which are urged by Romanist, Anglican and Puritan.

Having attempted at a former time to exhibit the Lutheran Sources of the Common Service, I have a desire also to show the other sources from which they are derived. But this would require a dull citation of originals, ill-suited to an oral lecture. I have chosen as my subject, *The Word of God in Christian Worship.* I do not propose to argue the supreme importance of the Word of God in the Lutheran Service; a position vindicated by Luther; and asserted with great force by a venerable teacher in this school. Let us take it for granted. The preëminence of the Word of God is the principle of Christian Worship. The attempt which I shall make to supply a commentary on the service of Christian Worship as an embodiment and realization of that principle, will, I hope, of itself establish it.

By "Christian Worship" I do not mean *all* forms of worship that at any time or place have been used by Christian men. I mean that use which is acknowledged and authorized among us. We are to be congratulated on the possession of a standard order of worship, a basis of comparison, a subject for study, a definite principle in the education and life of the Church. Of this I claim that it is a genuine development of the Christian principle, embodying the truth which must underly Christian

worship, freed from false accretions. Therefore, if we take it as our text, we may appeal to all Christian history for illustration while we analyze it. It is as really the worship of the Christian Church as our creeds set forth the Church's belief. Again, it is the service of worship of the Christian Church as it was reformed and purified by our teachers in the XVI. Century. It preserves *their* conception of what the worship of the Church ought to be; their rescue of the principles of communion with God from the abuses which in their day threatened to overwhelm them, and which in our day are reasserting themselves, and, fortified by the failure of the rejection of the historical service, need to be met again with the Word of God. I do not deny the Christianity of all other forms of worship than ours; but assert that this is the pure and complete service of Christian worship. My text, therefore, will be *the Common Service.*

I.

What do we mean by *the Word of God in the Worship of the Church?* God's word is the Revelation of Himself through His Son. "The Word of God" is not exactly identical with what we mean by "the Holy Scriptures." Dr. Fisher says in his History of Christian Doctrine, that although "the identity of the Holy Scriptures with the Word of God is generally assumed by Luther, and is occasionally expressed in explicit language," "the Word of God is a phrase which signifies to Luther the gospel of God's grace, whether it be proclaimed orally or in the Scriptures."

NOTE.—Compare the use of the word *Gospel* in the New Testament. Our Lord adopted this word, the *Gladtidings*, as the designation of that which He brought and told. In the lips of His disciples it became the customary description of His life and word and work. The manifestation, the teaching, the purpose, the commandment, the commission of Jesus, are habitually spoken of as *The Good News.* It meant the *Revelation of Christ* in the widest sense. St. Paul gave it a still wider connotation. It was not only the Revelation of Christ as set down in the stories of His life and the teachings of His disciples, in the faith once delivered to the saints and confessed again in their worship, but it meant to him the entire life of the Church, the purpose that absorbed its energies, the trust committed to it by the Master at His parting, the wonderful future which awaited it in

the world and in the world to come. The wonderful message he brought to the Philippians was the *beginning* of the Good News. In the mind of the Apostle and the Early Church the word Gospel included the faith, the fellowship of believers, and its mighty calling and work. It meant also the aggregate of the regenerative forces which the good news brought and applied. With this compare Clem. Rom. I. 47. Ign. *ad Phil.* 5, 8, 9. *ad Smyrn.* 5, 7. Mart. Pol. 19, 22. Of the use of Ignatius, the Dict. C. Biog., III. 218 says, "The Gospel is that which the apostles as the presbyterate of the Church proclaimed. It means not the four written gospels, but the substance of the message of salvation." Cf. also *Irenaeus*, II., 1, "We have learned from none others the plan of our salvation, than from those through whom the Gospel has come down to us, which they did at one time proclaim in public, and, at a later period, by the will of God, handed down to us in the Scriptures, to be the ground and pillar of our faith." 4, 2. "Many nations of those who believe in Christ do assent, having salvation written in their hearts by the Spirit, without paper and ink."

"The Church," says Dale, "existed before the Scriptures. The contents of the Christian revelation were made known by living speech before they were received in writing." When the first congregation gathered in Jerusalem, or the first Gentile Christians at Antioch, in the rapidly multiplying congregations of Asia Minor and Greece, the word of God, the New Testament as well as the Old, was the principle of their worship before one of the apostles had put pen to paper. The stories of the words and works of Jesus told by the apostles or their messengers, the explanations and applications of the Old Testament they offered, the injunctions and frequent criticisms based on the teaching of Christ, were the word of God. The Scriptures bear witness to a worship of the Church of which the teaching of the apostles was a part. The fourth and fifth chapters of the first Epistle to the Thessalonians show the Church using matter of Holy Scripture before it was written (4 : 1, 2), the New Testament in process of formation, (4 : 13–18), and the Church receiving the New Testament as it was being written (5 : 27).

It must also be admitted that there were other ways of setting that word forth than by words either written or spoken. There were signs of fellowship, symbols of the deep truths Jesus had taught, of the Atonement, of the Resurrection, of the commu-

nion between Him and them, which were as truly a Word of God as these books are. Had not St. Paul said that as often as they eat the bread and drank the wine, they did tell the Lord's death till He would come? So Luther says, "Christ, our Bread, is given to us in two ways; first, outwardly, through men, as for instance through the priests and teachers. And this also in two ways, first through the Word and secondly, through the Sacrament of the Altar." (21, 204.) So the *Apology*, 214, 4, 5: "When we are baptized, when we eat the Lord's body, when we are absolved, they ought certainly to assure us that God truly forgives us for Christ's sake. God at the same time by the Word and rites move hearts to believe and conceive faith. * * Just as the word enters the ears in order to strike hearts; so the rite itself meets the eyes, in order to move hearts. The effect of the word and the rite is the same, as it has been well said by Augustine that a sacrament is "a visible word." And Luther says in the Smalkald Articles, III. iv., "We will now return to the Gospel, which not merely in one way gives us counsel and aid against sin; for God is superabundantly rich in His grace. First, through the spoken Word, by which the forgiveness of sins is preached in the whole world; which is the peculiar office of the Gospel. Secondly, through Baptism. Thirdly, through the holy sacrament of the altar. Fourthly, through the power of the Keys, and also through the mutual conversation and consolation of brethren. Matt. 18 : 20."

2. In the second place, the word of God in the worship of the Church is both sacrament and sacrifice, it is at the same time the word of God and the word of His Church. This is most clearly seen in the Holy Scriptures. These books are either histories or historical documents. They are marked by the idiosyncrasies of those who wrote them; they are addressed to particular persons, and many of them were called forth by particular occasions; and, though, inasmuch as they deal with eternal and universal truths, they always are fresh and intelligible, they say most and speak most clearly to those who know the age in which they were written and are able to enter into sympathy with their authors and first readers. When our

Gospels first found their place in the regular worship of the Church, they were known as *Memorabilia of the Apostles*, and it was impossible for the first age to read them without sympathetic recollection of those holy men who first taught them by word of mouth. The Canon of Holy Scripture is the word of God given through the Church, by the Church treasured, sifted, acknowledged, arranged, preserved. It is her confession. It is at once God's word to her and the answer of her consciousness, like the Psalter in the Old Testament; the Shepherd's voice and the immediate response of His sheep who know His voice. So, further, as Kliefoth reminds us (iv. 102), the sermon is on the one side an explanation of God's word, and on the other hand a confession and testimony of the preacher and the congregation. "If the congregation sing, it does not pray only, but teaches and preaches to itself the word of God; and in the same hymn the prayer and supplication and praise can go on at the very same time as the mutual preaching and admonition. Here are both the sacrificial and the sacramental elements in the hymn. In the sacrament, we have the heavenly gift on the one side, and the thanksgiving and praise on the other."

3. It is to be noted that the Holy Scriptures are used in the worship of the Church as one indivisible organic revelation. There are diversities in the Canon, to which we shall have occasion to revert, an Old Testament and a New, Gospels and Epistles, Songs and Prose. But these distinctions are fused in the Church's liturgical use of Holy Scripture. She does not make a distinction between what was said in one age and what belongs to another, or present the parts of the Bible as a body of materials to be sifted, out of which each is for himself to construct a faith. The Old Testament is seen "in the light of the New." It is interpreted by the New. It is valued as a key to the fulfilment of it of which the New is an account. Its history is typical; its worship is the background; and its glorious songs become Christian prayers and hymns. The New Testament is not a thing *to be studied* in the worship of the Church in the expectation that it can make any change of its belief. The use of the Holy Scriptures is dominated by the

Church's creed; every part and text is interpreted according to the analogy of faith. In its worship this wonderful literature of many ages, many minds, many lands, becomes one word and one confession, telling but one thing—the grace and truth that came by Jesus Christ,—one confession, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God.

This absolute dominion of the *one faith* and the requirements of common worship, render it necessary that Christian worship, that it may be decent, should have an *order*, and that it should be directed by those who are "regularly called."

NOTE.—*Clem. Alex. Strom.*, vi. 15: "The Apostles accordingly say of the Lord, that He spake all things in parables, &c. (Matt. 13 : 34); and if all things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made, consequently also prophecy and law were made by Him, and were spoken by Him in parables. But all things are right, says the Scripture, before those who understand, Prov. 8 : 9, that is, those who receive and observe, according to the ecclesiastical rule, the exposition of the Scriptures explained by Him; and the ecclesiastical rule (κανῶν) is the concord and harmony of the law and the prophets in the covenant delivered at the coming of the Lord." See also Harnack, *Hy. of Doctrine* (Eng.) I. 292. Ib. 156, "The Old Testament revelations and oracles were regarded as pointing to Christ; the Old Testament itself, the words of God spoken by the prophets, as the primitive gospel of salvation, having in view the new people, which is, however, the oldest, and belonging to it alone. The exposition of the Old Testament, which, as a rule, was of course read in the Alexandrian Canon of the Bible, turned it into a Christian book." Ib. 176 n. "With the help of the Old Testament the teachers dated back the Christian religion to the beginning of the human race, and joined the preparations for the founding of the Christian community with the creation of the world. The Apologists were not the first to do so, for Barnabas and Hermas, and before these Paul, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and others had already done the same. This was undoubtedly to the cultivated classes one of the most impressive articles in the missionary preaching." Nösgen finds the pattern for this in one Lord—*Gesch. d. N. T., Offenbarung*, I. 274. Wie schon bei der Besprechung der Wunder Jesu sich herausstellte, war es durch die Gesammtheit der Weissagung bezeugte Vorhaben einer vollkommenden Erlösung, auf das Jesus hinklickte, wenn er von der Erfüllung der Propheten sprach (vgl. Matt. 11 : 3; Luke 4 : 16 ss.), Wie beim Gesetz beschäftigte ihn auch bei der Prophetie die Erfüllung des einzigen Wortes nur, sofern dieses ein Moment in dem Vorhaben Gottes für die Zukunft überhaupt enthielt und aussprach. Erst wenn man das im Auge behält, so wird Jesus

Art, auf Einzelnes im A. T. als Typus und Weissagung neutestamentliche Vorgänge zu berufen, völlig klar."

Diestel, Gesch. des A. T. in der Christlichen Kirche, I, says: Mit dem Kämpfe gegen die häretische Gnosis erwächst dem altkathol. Vätern die Pflicht, die Einheit der Testamente zu erhärten, während zugleich die Schriftauslegung selbst als zweifelhafte Stütze erkannt wird. Der satz von der Symphonie aller Offenbarung prägt sich aus in der exegetischen Norm der Glaubensregel, in der Herrschaft der Lehrtradition über die Auslegung. * * *

Christus erscheint besonders auf dem Boden deutscher Reformation, als der Mittelpunkt der schrift. Denn als Ganzes war sie überliefert: so ist Christus nicht nur Ende, sondern auch Centrum des A. T. Und wie mit dem Zusammenfallen der theokratischen Kirchenidee das gesetzliche Moment zurücktrat, so war es nur folgerichtig, das A. T. ausschlieszlich als prophetische Schrift zu betrachten. * * * Auf lutherischem Boden erfährt die Schrift wohl die höchste Ehre, darf aber nur die feststehende Doctrin beglaubigen." Tert. *adv Prax.* 11. Fere omnes (Psalmi) Christi personam sustinent, Christum ad Deum verba facientem repraesentabant. *Diestel* again 6. 5. Man griff zu den Haupt-schlüssel —der apostolischen Ueberlieferung, in der man den Christlichen Gemeingeist in seiner vollen Reinheit erbickte. Man glaubte dieselbe fixiren zu können in der Glaubensregel; sie wird das Masz der Auslegung." Origen is quoted: "Omnis paene hostia, quae offertur, habet aliquid formae et imaginis Christi. Justin, Ap. 32. Christ is the interpreter of the prophecies. Uee also Rev. 19 : 10.

"Jesus hatte bei seiner Verkündigung auf Erden beständig an die alttestamentliche Vorstufe der Offenbarung angeknüpft." Nösgen, II. 436.

4. The word of God in the worship of the Church has not a magical efficacy. It is not used as an incantation. It is efficient only as God's *revelation* to men; it is addressed to intelligent men. For this reason, it has no sense, unless in the vernacular. It is an abuse to say it in the Christian assembly in an undertone, as *secreta.* Our forefathers rightly demanded that, according to its nature and purpose, it should be said to the congregation (not to or over inanimate things) and in a tongue they could understand.

5. But while the Church from the first recognized the unity of the word of God which speaks to us through the Holy Scriptures, she did not lose sight of the distinctions within them. There were three elements, Prophecy, the Testimony of the inspired Church, and the words of the Saviour Himself, and she

emphasized this by the different respect she paid to the Old Testament, the Epistles of the Apostles, and the Gospel. She was built upon the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief cornerstone.

II.

I propose to examine with you *the manner in which the word of God is set forth in the worship of the Church.*

The worship of the Church consists of certain fixed parts which are found in every complete service but give a varying sense according as certain variable parts are supplied. The Confession, the Introit, the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the collect, the Lessons, Creed and Sermon, the Prayer, the Holy Supper, are the outline of the service. Let us at first confine our attention to the framework of the service.

The element of Christian Worship which was first historically and is still first in importance, is the Holy Eucharist. It will not be denied that the celebration of the Holy Supper was the characteristic of the earliest distinctively Christian Worship. In those first days when the Apostles and brethren still went up to the temple to pray, it was the distinctively Christian service when believers met *to break bread* together; and when, shortly afterwards, they spoke in the synagogues or disputed in the schools or exhorted from house to house, when those who had become believers actually gathered for the service of worship which answered to to their fellowship, it was to break bread with the Lord. The earliest Christian documents agree with the description which Pliny gives of the worship of the Church.

You will recall that St. Paul says of this that it is a proclamation of the death of Christ. This dictum of his applies not to the words of Institution repeated in the Service only, but extends to the whole of it: As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show forth, proclaim (καταγγέλετε), the Lord's death till he come. It was primarily, then, a proclamation of the Lord's death; of the fact of His death; and, inasmuch as it was celebrated by those who did it at His command and in remembrance of Him, who called to mind all that be-

longed to the Institution of the Supper, it was a confession and proclamation of the Nature and Effect of that death. It was their Passover, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, a participation in the sacrifice that atoned for their sins, the Great High Priest meanwhile sprinkling His Blood in heaven and making intercession for them. The Holy Supper fulfilled our Lord's parting injunction in the Gospel of Luke, to preach in His name remission of sins among all nations. In it the Blood bears witness.

NOTE.—Here it is significant that the Ancient Church prayed for the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the elements. Through them, as through the written word, He bears witness. Thus *Lit. St. James:* "Accept them * * * and send Thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice—the Spirit that is witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus—that He may declare this bread the body of Thy Christ, and this cup the blood of Thy Christ: that all who partake thereof may be confirmed in godliness and obtain remission of sins: may be delivered from the devil and his errors: may be filled with the Holy Ghost, and being made worthy of Christ and reconciled to Thee, O Lord God Almighty, may obtain eternal life." So also the Clementine. The *Lit. St. Mark* says, "Send the Paraclete Himself, holy, powerful, and life-giving, the Spirit of truth, who spake in the Lord, the apostles, and the prophets * * * send upon us also, and upon this bread, and upon these chalices, Thy Holy Spirit, &c."

I have said, the Holy Supper declared more than the *fact* of our Lord's death. Much more was comprised in the declaration of His death than any age of the Church has comprehended. It is well-known that the explanation we give of the Atonement by the blood of Christ was not familiar in the earlier ages of the Church, although now it seems to us that the texts of Holy Scripture cannot be made to bear any other sense than the "Satisfaction" that was excogitated by Anselm and the substitution-theory of later divines; but before these were explanations, which, puerile as they appear, answered to the tone of mind of those days. Throughout this progress of opinion, and leading forward to the complete apprehension of truth, the Holy Supper has declared *the death of Christ* and laid that fact at the basis of Christian Worship, hope and life. It has helped the Church to know nothing but Christ and Him crucified, to glory in the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ, by which the world is crucified unto us and we are crucified to the world.

But the Holy Supper declared much more than *the death of Christ.* The words of St. Paul, while they establish our position that the Holy Supper is a *showing-forth* of the Gospel, do not confine its message to His death. Those are wrong who make it only a sad memorial of the crucifixion. This do, our Lord said, In remembrance of Me. It will be found, I think, that the Christians of the first ages customarily regarded it as an anamnesis of the Incarnation of our Lord even more than of His death.

NOTE.—Sunday was a commemoration of creation as well as of Redemption. Cf. Harn. DG. II. 178: "By expounding pure Monotheism and giving it the main place in his argument, Aristides gave supreme prominence to the very doctrine which simple Christians prized as most important." Ib. 255. "Like the Apologists, the early Catholic Fathers confess that the doctrine of God the Creator is the first and most important of the main articles of the Christian faith." To this moment may be due the use of the first verses of the Gospel of St. John at the close of the Roman Mass. See *Liturgy of St. Mark*, XVI. "For truly heaven and earth are full of Thy glory, through the manifestation of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ." "While we show forth the death of Thine only begotten Son our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ, and acknowledge His blessed resurrection on the third day, we do openly declare His ascension into heaven, and His sitting on the right hand of Thee, God and Father, and await His second terrible and dreadful coming, &c." Mel. *Ex, Ord.* 62. Secundo accedat Gratiarum actio pro filii missione, pro assumptione humanae naturae, pro redemptione, pro donatione Evangelii, pro vivificatione, quae fit per ipsum et Spiritum sanctum, pro restitutione vitae eternae, pro collectione ecclesiae. Utrumque complectitur Dominus, videlicet, confirmationem Fidei, et Gratiarum actionem, cum inquit: Hoc facite in mei recordationem. Compare App. Const., VII., 39.

There were reasons for this. While Jewish Christians might find in it the antitype of their Passover belonging to the new people of God (1 Thess. 1 : 1), Gentile believers, however they may have been led to share in those principles of fellowship with God by continual use of the Old Testament Scriptures, were apt to think more of the falsehoods and uncertainties about Creation and Providence from which they had been delivered by the Gospel (Acts 14 : 15, 17). They delighted in the knowledge of the One True God,—in the First Article of the Creed as it was mediated to them by the Second—and in the assurance that our great God and Saviour had come down into

His Creation for us. God our Maker, our God, God made flesh, God imparting Himself to us in His creatures of bread and wine presented as representative of His whole varied creation, these were, or quickly became, and by a pure and genuine development of truth, the main thoughts of the worshipers. The first controversies, traces of which are found even in the Scriptures, were about these points—as to our Lord's Godhead, as to the reality of His Incarnation, as to His relation to the creation,—Ebionism, Docetism, Gnosticism, Arianism show how real this question was and justify the central witness of the blood which the early Church perceived in the Holy Supper.

The same argument extends to every element of the Gospel. We shall show how the churchly use of the Holy Scriptures brings out this fulness of the declaration of God's word by the Holy Supper; which, moreover, is served by the *Prefaces* in the Communion.

The Holy Supper was a common meal of Christian fellowship. Its nature, its institution, the thirteenth of John, its repetition, the care with which those not entitled to it were excluded, the reservation of the blessed elements for the absent, the use of it as a mark of recognition and brotherhood, all show that it was intended to declare the *unity* of the Christian believers. It was a sign of fellowship, and a declaration of it. It was a *communion;* a communion of each with all; of all with one another; of all and each with Christ, and set forth the Gospel of our Lord's sacerdotal prayer. The Church is right in regarding it as a ceremony in which she takes part as *a whole*, in communion, in mystic union, with her Head, offering herself in His offering, pleading with His intercession (Heb. 4 : 16), and bearing the burden of the general want and of the lack and woe of each with Him.

NOTE.—*Didache. Apology.*

Compare also the prayer in the Liturgies for the descent of the Holy Ghost *on us*.

Cyprian Ep. LXII. As many grains, collected, and ground, and mixed together in one mass, make one bread; so in Christ, who is the heavenly head, we may know there is one body, with which our number is joined and united. Ep. LXXV. When the Lord calls bread, which

is combined by the union of many grains, His body, He indicates our people whom He bore as being united; and when He calls the wine, which is pressed from many grapes and clusters collected together, His blood, He also signifies one flock linked together by the mingling of a united multitude. Aug. on Ps. LI. : 21. Not even we have been left without a sacrifice to offer to God. Whence shall we propitiate Him? Offer; certainly in thyself thou hast what thou mayest offer. Do not from without fetch frankincense, but say, In me are, O God, Thy vows. I will render praise to Thee. Do not from without seek cattle to slay, thou hast in thyself what thou mayest kill. The sacrifice of God is a broken spirit. On Ps. CXXXI. He prayeth in the temple of God, who prayeth in the peace of the Church, in the unity of Christ's Body; which Body of Christ consisteth of many who believe in the whole world."

Dict. Christian Biog. II. 252. "It should be noted that in this passage, the phrase 'Corpus Christi' bears two senses, not one. In other words, Christ has two bodies: one with which He was born and rose, the other which is the aggregate of His elect people: or His mystical body, called the Church. Of these the latter owes all its life to the first: yet so, that participation in the life bestowed by the first is limited to those who compose the last. The act of the Holy Ghost at the font engrafts men members of the last; and then, subsequently, the act of the Holy Ghost at the altar supplies them with the first to be their food through life? For we, being many, are one bread—one body—for we are all partakers of that one bread': as the apostle says. And this, as St. Augustine teaches, is also symbolized in the Eucharist: 'Unus panis: quis est iste unus panis? Unum corpus multi. Recolite quia panis non sit de uno grano, sed de multis * * * et sic de vino. Fratres, recolite unde sit vinum. Grana multa pendent ad botrum: sed liquor granorum in unitate confunditur. Ita et Dominus Christus nos significavit, nos ad se pertinere voluit, mysterium pacis et unitatis nostrae in sua mensa consecravit." (Senn. CCIXXII., ed. Ben.)

Nösgen, *Gesch d. N. T. Off'b'g.* II. 459. Die Offenbarung kennt keine anderen Rauchopfer als die Gebete der Heiligen (5 : 8; 8 : 3, 4), und die Gemeinde der Treuen, der bewährten Christen, welche auch nicht blosz eine bevorzeigte Klasse unter den Glaübigen ist, sondern diese sämtlich umfaszt, bildet selber die dem Gott und dem Lamme augenehme Erstlingsgarbe aus der Welt (14 : 4)."

The Holy Supper is a sacrificial meal. We must remember that not only were the first Christians, both Jews and Gentiles, familiar with sacrificial usages; they were not able to think the thoughts which belong to religion in any other forms. The disciples of our Lord had taken part in peace- and thank-offerings in the Temple, and their feasts had been sacraments. The Pass-

over was a sacramental feast, bringing the assurance of God's merciful care. The Holy Supper was a sacrificial feast, sealing to those partaking of it in faith forgiveness, acceptance, reconciliation, grace, reception into fellowship with God and His people, in spite of the sin which the atoning Death it declared had covered. "There can be no doubt," says Melanchthon, Ex. Ord., (23.) 57; "that the sacraments are an application to individual persons of the promise offered to all; as Paul says, Circumcision was the seal of righteousness, *i. e.* an assertion of the promise and a pledge of the application of it."

NOTE.—It is not wonderful that the Bread and Wine in the story of Melchizedek is so often made to point to the Holy Supper. Westcott on Heb. p. 201 says, "He presents, and we cannot but believe He purposely presents, Melchizedek as priest, not in sacrificing but in blessing, that is, in communicating the fruits of an efficacious sacrifice already made."

Westcott on Heb. 3 : 14, quotes *Primasius*: Christo participamur et jungimur utpote unum et in illo existentes; siquidem hoc participamur illi quia ipse caput nostrum et nos membra illius, cohaeredes et concorporales illi secundum spiritalem hominem, qui creatus est in illo. In eo etiam participamur, quia corpus et sanguinem ejus sumimus ad redemptionem nostram.

We may learn a great deal from a comparison of the different formulas which were proposed for the Exhortation in the Holy Communion in the XVI. Century. In ours, which is taken from the Nuremberg form of 1525, it is said 1. That He hath had mercy upon us and taken upon Himself our nature; 2. That He hath fulfilled for us the whole will and law of God; 3. That for us and our salvation He has suffered death and all that we by our sins have deserved. In the original Osiander says, "After Supper He took the Bread, gave thanks, brake and said, This is my Body, given for you; as if to say, That I became man, and all that I do and suffer, all is yours, done for you and for your good; and as a certain proof of it I give you my Body to eat. After the same manner He took the Cup and said, Take it and drink ye all of it; This is the Cup of the New Testament in my Blood which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins. As often as ye do this, ye do it in remembrance of me. As if to say, Because I took upon me your nature and have taken upon me your sin, I will offer myself to death for sin, will pour out my Blood to purchase grace and forgiveness of sin, and thus institute a new covenant, in which sin shall be remembered no more. As a certain proof of this I give you my Blood to drink." *Antwerp* 1567, says, "The Holy Supper renders us certain of our union with Christ and eventual participation in His glory." *Meck-*

lenburg says, "In testimony that even to you this grace is given and applied, ye are to take the Body and Blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, and to know that for you the Lord Christ was offered on the Cross, and gave His Body for you; and that the Lord Christ maketh you members of His Body and will show forth His power in you."

The Holy Supper was in the conception of the early Church a Thankoffering, a Thanksgiving, the Eucharist. How could it be anything else to those who appreciated their deliverance out of the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of the Son of God's love? By this name it was called. And when we remember how Paul exhorts his converts to unremitted thanksgivings, and speaks of services being valuable as causing *thanksgivings* to God, and consider how he joins all prayer with thanksgivings, and uses in connection with thanksgiving terms which are elsewhere so closely associated with the Holy Eucharist, it is difficult to believe that the Holy Supper was not called by this name in the days of the Apostles. And the Eucharist of the first Christians was not merely a saying of thanks. Their thanksgiving was a thankoffering. They *offered* bread and wine (accustomed to this by bloodless offerings in the temple as well as by Gentile customs in worship), and these were representative of all God's gifts in creation, intended to say, All that we have is Thine; and through and with them they gave themselves in thanksgiving. If the Lord gave His Body, if He gave His Body by means of His creature, so did He also make them His Body, and they offered to Him His Body, the Church.

NOTE—See especially 2 Cor. 4 : 15; 9 : 11, 12; Phil. 4 : 6; 1 Cor. 14 : 16.

Luther (quoted in Kliefoth IV. 63), says, Darum sollen wir des Worts Opfer wohl wahrnehmen, dasz wir nicht vermessen Etwas Gott zu geben in dem Sacrament, so er mit darinnen alle Dinge giebt. Wir sollen geistlich opfern, dieweil die leiblichen Opfer abgegangen, und in Kirchen, Klöster, Spitalgüter verwandelt sind. Was sollen wir denn opfern? uns selbst uns Alles was wir haben mit fleiszigem Gebet, wie wir sagen: Dein Wille geschehe auf Erden als im Himmel. Hiemit wir uns dargeben sollen göttlichem Willen, dasz es von und aus uns mache, was er will nach seinem göttlichen Wohlgefallen; dazu ihm Lob und Dank opfern, aus ganzem Herzen, für seine unaussprechliche süsze Gnade und Barmherzigkeit, die er uns in diesem Sacrament zugesagt und gegeben hat. Und Wiewohl solch Opfer auch auszer der Messe

geschieht und geschehen soll, denn es nicht nöthig und wesentlich zur Messe gehört, wie gesagt ist; so ist's doch köstlicher, füglicher, stärker und auch angenehmer, wo es mit dem Haufen und in der Sammlung geschieht, da Eines das Andere reizt, bewegt, und erhitzt, dasz es stark zu Gott dringt, und damit erlangt ohne allen Zweifel was es will.

So the Holy Supper is a showing forth of the Gospel, from the Incarnation of the Son of God till He is delivered for our offenses and raised again for our justification, of His exaltation to the Right Hand of God and His perpetual intercession for us. It declares also the reality of His Church, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all, our blessed fellowship with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ, whose blood cleanses us from all sins.

2

The Word of God is declared in Christian Worship also in the use of the Holy Scriptures. The Lessons, the Creed and the Sermon belong together. In the Epistle and Gospel an appropriate part of the word of God is read; by the use of the Creed it is properly set in its relation to the whole Gospel; and in the Sermon it is "rightly divided," that is, explained and applied to individual persons and the occasion.

From the beginning the Old Testament was read in the Christian assemblies. Jews were accustomed to this in the synagogue, and those of heathen origin adopted the custom. These searched the Scriptures because they testified of Christ. How diligent use they made of them is shown by the abundant citations and comments of the earliest apologists; and I am inclined to the belief that the prophets of the apostolic period were men who were enabled by the Spirit to open the sense of the Old Testament and show Christ in it. The Old Testament interpretation of the Apologists and the extended address of the *Preface* to the communion in the earliest liturgies may be an example of such prophetic utterance. Such a use of sacred books in worship was new to the majority of those who became Christians. Their manner of using them throws light on the estimation in which they held the Apostolic writings when these had gradually come into existence, were adopted in the service

of the Church, and were made a Canon on a plane with the Old Testament. The Old Testament Scriptures were regarded rather as prophecy and a record of types, than as history. Their use in Christian worship is witnessed by Justin Martyr and persisted in the chief service until the time of Augustine. We find an Old Testament lection in the Mozarabic Mass, and in the Gallican Mass up to 600 A. D., and in the Ambrosian Mass still used occasionally in Milan; and Augustine expressly makes the Psalm after the Epistle the representative of it.

NOTE.—Justin Apol I. 30, 53, 61. Tryph. 119. Ep. Barn. 9. Klieforth III. 371.

Diestel § 5. 1. Das A. T. is der einzige Massgebende Norm der Kirche bis zur Zeit der grossen katholischen Väter, mochten auch andere Schriften rein christlichen Ursprungs daneben gebraucht werden und in Ansehen stehen. 3. Doch schwebte bei diesen Ideen den Kirchenvätern stets eine solche Auschauung vom A. T. vor, welche alle progressiven Elemente stark hervorhebt und alles rein Zeitliche als episodisch und als von den Propheten selber gewollte erkannte.

§6. 2. Dasz das richtige schriftverständnisz durch die Erkenntnisz des Erfüllungscharakters im Christenthume bedingt sei, spricht sich in der Behauptung aus, dass die biblische Gnosis ein Charisma sei, eine von Gott den Christen gegebene Gnade * * * Die Ewigkeit des Christenthumes *a parte post* fordert das Gleiche *a parte ante* zu constatiren; alle göttliche Wahrheit muss in sich eine und identische sein.

We may be sure that the story of what Christ did and taught and the application of it to the conduct of believers formed a part of the usual worship of the Church from the first. The testimony of eyewitnesses, of those who had heard their testimony, the "teaching" of the Apostles or the "tradition" or "charge" they gave to their converts, the comment of prophets and teachers, and finally written records and Apostolic letters, filled this place. Eastman (*Principles of Divine Service* I. I., 332) finds the place set for the Gospel in the account of the Institution of the Last Supper in the Gospel of St. John: "After the commandment to love one another, the Saviour proceeded at once to unfold the objective Faith, which was to be the stay and solace of the world till He should come again. This was His Gospel, the detailed announcement of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and of their several offices henceforth towards man (St.

John 14 : 1–26)." Nösgen (Gesch. d. N. T. Offenbarung, I. 146) says of the Gospel of Matthew, "This presentation from the pen of an eyewitness appeared to be a complete substitute for oral testimony to the story of the Lord. Its compass, and its combination of the deeds and words of the Lord, was for earliest Christianity an embodiment of the witness of the first disciples to their Master. This led to the general use of this book, written before the destruction of Jerusalem, and made it the weightiest book ever written. In it the Lord spoke directly to His people, as the Apostles spoke to them through their letters."

This marks the real principle of the distinction that always has been made in the worship of the Church, between the Epistles and the Gospels. The former were known as *the Apostle;* the latter are first called, *The Memorabilia of the Apostles.* The Epistles, as Bernard says (*The Progress of Doctrine in the N. T.*) are "the voice of the Spirit within the Church to those who are within it;" the Gospel is the voice of the Master Himself. At the Gospel the congregation stood, at the time of the writing of the earliest books of the *Apostolic Constitutions;* in aftertime the Epistle was read from a lower pulpit; and the Gospel was set about with prayers and responses, some of which are retained in our own service.

NOTE.—Justin, *Ap.* I. 67; Rev. †=3; Herm. Vis. II. 4; Dionys. Cor. in Eus. IV, 23, 11. See Harnack, DG. II. 41, 42. App. CC. II. 57; Kliefoth III. 306, 7; V. 32–34.

Attendere autem Prophetis, praecipue vero Evangelio, in quo passio nobis ostensa est, et resurrectio perfecta est. Ign. Smyrn. VII. See Phil. IX.

At first it was the prerogative of the Bishop to select the passages of Holy Scripture to be read. At a very early period certain sections were assigned to certain days. A letter of Jerome is preserved, which Ranke (E. Ranke, *Das Perikopensystem*, &c., 262) traces back to 1000 A. D., which forms an introduction to his *Comes*, in which he made an arrangement of passages of Holy Scripture for the Seasons and Days of the Christian Year, intended to be "A companion to life and a luminous heart of the Bible;" and in which he was careful to treasure the usages, and the order of reading the Scriptures,

and the connecting ideas, which he found in the Churches. As the *Comes* of Jerome may therefore have been a revised thesaurus of the usage which had gradually formed itself in the Church up to his time, so without doubt it has remained the core of the lectionary that has come down to us through the revisions of Charlemagne and the Reformers.

3.

But not only in the Holy Eucharist and the Lessons from Holy Scripture, as they are interpreted by the Creed and explained and applied in the Sermon, is the Word of God, the Revelation of God in Jesus Christ, set forth the worship of the Church. The very structure of the Service is a declaration of the Word of God. By the Confession and Absolution with which it opens, as well as by its central celebration of the atoning death of Christ, and by its repeated absolution—in the declaration of grace, the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the Sermon, the Pax, the Benediction,—it teaches that the only way of access to the Father is through the death of Christ for the sins of the world. Throughout the Service we are suppliants—conscious sinners, yet sons of God by grace, equally assured of our infinite need and confident of God's infinite grace. Upon this is based every prayer. And these prayers are said in the unity of the Body of Christ and in virtue of His perfect sacrifice.

4.

We need not linger to show how the Word of God is declared also in the *hymns* of the Service. St. Paul had enjoined the Christians of Colossae to teach and admonish one another in Psalms and hymns and spiritual songs. The educative use of holy song was keenly recognized in the Reformation. Perhaps in no way is Christian truth more impressed on the minds of the simple. In hours of intense inward struggle all of us have derived strength from the Word of God condensed into a line of a hymn. We should recognize the preaching office of sacred song. In it we do not only confess to God, but preach to one another, to the children, to the world. Our hymns should be

pure and true, and the use of the Psalter, arranged and interpreted by the Gospel, must be characteristic of Christian Worship.

5.

But I cannot leave unmentioned another means of the proclamation of the word of God in our worship—I mean *in the prayers of the Church*, first in their structure and composition, and then in their words. The *Litany*, for instance, in its direct address to Christ teaches His Divinity, as in its obsecrations it declares the direct reference to us of everything He is and did. The *Bidding Prayer* emphasizes the presence in the world of a fellowship which is the Body of the Risen Lord, which shares His mission and breathes His spirit of love and fills up what was lacking of His sufferings. The use of the Lord's Prayer assures us of our welcome to that fellowship and puts us into right relation to our Heavenly Father. And the structure of the Collects, based as they are on an Attribute or some definite word of God, and pleading the name and promise of the Lord Jesus Christ, and claiming the particular gift which belongs to each declaration of the Gospel in its turn, is an exhaustless setting-forth and analysis of the exhaustless Revelation of God to men in our Lord Jesus Christ.

They teach the spirit in which we ought to pray, and that our prayers should be for one another. They set forth what the experience of the Church under the guidance of the word of God shows the burden of her prayers should be. Prayer is natural. Misery cries out of itself. But Christian prayer is more than natural. It is a gift of God. We pray as we do, because we are taught to pray thus. Our prayer is not a mere cry; it is an affectionate trustful answer to the grace of God given and avouched to us in our Lord Jesus Christ. This book in the hands of our children, and the reverent use of it through many years, teaches what God wants us to know about prayer, and about the Hearer and Answerer of prayer.

What, for instance, do the Collects teach about the nature of

God? First, that we address God who has revealed Himself in our Lord Jesus Christ. We do not call Him the Supreme Being, the Great First Cause, the Architect of the Universe; or use similar highsounding titles by which those who seek to avoid a precise acknowledgment of His truth only try to veil a denial of Him. The Collects teach the doctrine of the Trinity. They teach the Divinity of our Lord. They teach the doctrine of the Atonement. See how much of the Gospel they put into our hearts: It is "He who gave His eternal Son to be made incarnate of a pure Virgin," and made Christmas Eve "to shine with the brightness of the true Light," and "made His Son subject to the Law." "By the leading of a star He manifested His Only-begotten Son to the Gentiles;" "in His glorious Transfiguration He confirmed the mysteries of the faith by the testimony of the fathers and did foreshow the adoption of sons;" and He sent Him in our flesh "to suffer death upon the cross that all mankind should follow the example of His great humility." Christ "overcame death, and opened unto us the gate of everlasting life." "By the humiliation of His Son God raised up a fallen world, and showed unto them that be in error the light of His truth to the intent that they may return into the way of righteousness." "He never fails to help those whom He brings up in his steadfast fear and love." Though "without Him they are not able to please Him," by His gift His faithful people do unto Him true and laudable service." How wonderfully do the Collects repeat the Creed and confess the Gospel. They put the knowledge of the Most High into the hearts of the children of the Church, not as an empty formula, but as the means of faith and prayer, and an instrument of comfort and power.

They teach us much more about God. He "knows us to be set in the midst of so many and great dangers, that by reason of the frailty of our nature we cannot always stand upright." He sees "that we put not our trust in anything that we do." He hates "nothing that He has made and forgives the sins of all who are penitent." He "sees we have no strength," and "is the strength of all them that put their trust in Him." He is "the

Author and Giver of all good things." "His never-failing providence orders all things both in heaven and earth." His Almighty Power "He declares chiefly in showing mercy and pity." "He is more ready to hear than we to pray, and is wont to give more than either we desire or deserve," and therefore is "Our Refuge and Strength." Surely here is the Christian theology. He who prays these prayers, and grounds his petitions on this faith in God, has what he asks for, and "serves God with a quiet mind." By teaching us whom we are speaking to, and putting into our lips a right faith in Him, God's Spirit takes the first step to help our infirmities and teach us what things we should pray for as we ought.

NOTE.—The Collects, the utterance of the faith of the Church in all ages, which has been begotten in her by the Holy Spirit through the word, are, like all the other parts of the Service, but perhaps in a greater degree, the continued testimony of the Church—the word of God *living* in the Church; the proof that the Comforter brings to mind all that Jesus did and said and leads into all the truth; our witness, and His witness with us.

6.

But not half of the office of our worship in showing forth the word of the Lord is shown, so long as we consider only the unchanging parts of the service, which we have called the *consonants;* it is by means of the variable parts, the *vowels*, that the whole compass of the revelation of God is presented, in its fulness and its organic completeness. As the old service-books will show, the worship of the Church is conceived as a distinct whole on every separate Sunday or Festival. The Introit, the Collect, the Epistle, the Gospel, the Responses, the Hymn, the Preface, the Communio, are selected and arranged to set forth in order *first*, the essential facts on which salvation is based, and *secondly*, the essential traits of the teaching of Christ. It is not as if all this had been prearranged. The Introits have their own history, the Collects theirs, the Gospels and Epistles followed an independent development, and the Prefaces again had their own beginning and their own periods of reformation. But we speak of the Service as we have it; and, with such qualification as we shall

immediately offer, we may say that the variable parts of the Service are so related to each other that, set with the fixed parts, the Service on each Sunday presents a distinct gift to faith and lesson to conduct, and in the course of the year takes us through a complete review of the Gospel of Christ. Although there is some variation in the arrangement of Introits, Gospels, Epistles and Collects, so that between the First Sunday after Trinity and Advent we differ from the Roman Church, and between the Third Sunday after Trinity and Advent we differ from the Anglican Church, the order observed in our book accords with the old use back to the time of Charlemagne. And, we may add, that order and these constituents of it abide as a testimony to the kernel of truth which was in the Church in spite of the usurpations of Rome and the abuses of the times. No one can be familiar with the Roman Breviary without having been struck by the immense contrast between the *propria* of the Saints' Days and the *propria* of the Sundays and Christian Festivals, and the parts which belong to the Fasts and those where there was no temptation to interject Romish error. A skillful man can easily do what our reformers did—loosen and pull out from the delicate organism the parts which plead a propitiatory sacrifice in the Mass, the merits of human service, and the worship of creatures, and leave unhurt in all its native and renewed force the wonderful declaration of the Gospel which Christian worship has grown to be in the life of the people of God.

We must indeed confess that it is not *always* possible to account for *all* the parts of the Service and to show their mutual pertinence. This, partly because our times and our habits of thought are so different from the periods in which they were selected. We occupy a different stage of knowledge of Scripture and its doctrine. For some days, no doubt, better selections might be found; as Luther arranged an appropriate ending to the Church Year instead of the awkward recourse to the Epiphany Sundays which the Anglicans retain. Yet you are to heed these words of Augustine: "Not indeed all things which are told must be thought to have a special significance, but they are added for the sake of those which *do* mean something. So

the ground is torn only by the ploughshare, but the other parts of the plough are necessary to it; and though only the strings of a harp give forth sound, the other parts of the instrument are needed, though the player never strikes them. They resound, because these hold them together."

In the Great Festivals, with their seasons of preparation and succeeding Sundays, are shown forth the essential facts of the Creed, independently of the particular selections of Scripture which belong to them and in sublime disregard of all the debate of critics as to the exact text of the original manuscripts. The Incarnation, the Miraculous Birth, the Manifestation, the Sacrificial Death, the Resurrection, the Ascension to the Right Hand of God, and the Outpouring of the Holy Spirit are confessed and proclaimed in the life and worship of the Church, which thus bears witness to and with the Scriptures and to that interpretation of them which accords with the faith once delivered to the saints.

The other part of the Church Year also has significance. It signalizes the application of the Word of God in the history of the world. As it is demonstrable that every Sunday in the former and great half of the year has its own character and voice, yet is best understood in its connection with other days in the Easter-cycle, or Christmas-cycle, for instance, so history shows us that the Sundays after Trinity (known in the Church of Rome as *Sundays after Pentecost*) were first grouped around certain days observed in the Western Church, derived their character from that relation, and are to be studied in it. They were known as Sundays before and after the *day of Peter and Paul*, June 29th, *St. Lawrence*, the deacon and treasurer of Rome, Aug. 10th, and *St. Michael and All Angels*, Sept. 29; and accordingly they are arranged to show the lessons which belong

1. to the gathering of the Church and the formation of the Christian life;

2. to the life of the Church and the progress of Christian character;

3. to the Church Triumphant and the goal of the Christian faith.

I propose to illustrate this by a more detailed examina-

tion of the *propria* of these Sundays, the manner in which all the *propria* converge upon one lesson, or one datum of faith. Let us take two instances in which the correspondence is not immediately apparent, the 9th and the 16th Sundays after Trinity. On the *Ninth Sunday after Trinity* the Collect, Epistle and Gospel agree in the rebuke of a worldly mind and a recognition of its temptations. The Introit emphasizes the sole but certain resource. And if you turn to the daily lessons you will find that though they belong to the continuous reading of the Bible, they refer to the right use of the things of this world and the choice of wisdom above everything else. On the *Sixteenth Sunday after Trinity* the Introit is the cry of a trustful soul to God. It expresses a sense of the deepest need. It also asserts an experience of the Lord's goodness, longsuffering and mercy. The Collect asks that the grace of God may compass us about, "go before" and "follow after" us, and present "us unbrokenly intent on good works," The Epistle is one of Paul's prayers for his converts (Eph. 3 : 13–21), in which he asks that they may rise to the apprehension of the love of Christ and be filled unto all the fulness of God. The Gospel is the story of the raising to life of the widow of Nain's son. The keynote of the day is Eph. 3 : 20, Unto Him who is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us. The Gospel illustrates this: To the widow the Lord says, Weep not. He answers her natural surprise with a manifestation *of the wonderful power God has given unto men*, which, operating in the dead man, raises him to life. It is the assurance that if Paul could *ask* the stupendous thing written in the Epistle, God is able to do it; and the power that worketh in us, which raised a dead man to life, is great enough, going before and following after us, to make us to be given to all good works.

In studying the pericope for a Sunday it always is well to consider the light which the daily lessons throw upon it. Those for the Saturday before, and the Monday after, the 16th Sunday, have been chosen on the general principle of *lectio continua*, modified by the churchly distribution of the books of the Bible among the Christian Seasons. The morning lessons which pre-

pare for the Sunday Gospel and continue its gift are, 1. the assurance that, though we are in danger of missing the promises of God, our forerunner, Jesus, a highpriest forever after the order of Melchizedek, is for us entered within the veil (Heb. 6 : 1–20), and, 2. that He is able to save unto the uttermost those who come unto God by Him (Heb. 7 : 1–28); and the Old Testament lessons for the Evening are Jer. 25 : 1–14 and 37 : 1–21, 1. Promise in the midst of darkness, and, 2. Warning against the vanity of depending on any other than God. How beautifully do these lessons serve the Epistle and Gospel and agree with the Collect which is to be said with them.

It will be interesting in this connection to examine the Scripture Lessons proposed for this Sunday (in the Minor Services) in the varying tables of our three books. The Church Book in its lessons (usually so admirably chosen) errs here in making the *nerve* of the day to be an awakening from the dead (Deut. 32 : 39, 40, I kill, and I make alive; 1 Cor. 15 : 21–28, As by man came death; John 11 : 19–45, the Resurrection of Lazarus). Thomasius (in the General Synod's book) has 1 Kings 17 : 17–24, the raising of the Shunamite's son; Matt. 25 : 14–30, the parable of the Talents; and 1 Thess. 5 : 14–24, another great prayer of Paul for his converts. This is a much better parallel to the Epistle and Gospel. The United Synod's book has Matt. 13 : 43–52, the parables of the Pearl of Great Price and the Dragnet; Acts 17 : 15–30, Paul's Sermon at Athens; 2 Chron. 7 : 12–22, Solomon's Prayer that God would dwell in the Temple, a manifest reference to Paul's prayer that Christ may dwell in our hearts by faith; and Jer. 17 : 5–10, Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and Blessed be the man that trusteth in the Lord. Without doubt this also has caught the note of the day.

This is an admirable example of what may be called the *churchly* arrangement and interpretation of Scripture—without absolute authority in any case, submitting itself freely to the spiritual judgment, and commending itself by the fulness with which it imparts the grace and wisdom of God. The mere use of these passages in relation to each other, is edifying.

III.

We have seen how the word of God is set forth, divided, interpreted and applied specially in the worship of the Church. But it is to be noted that the primary object of this service of worship is not the declaration of the word of God to unbelievers. We are considering *Christian Worship*, the characteristic, peculiar, historical worship of the Church of Christ. In this the word of God is not promulgated as a new and unfamiliar truth. It is not waited for with critical suspense of mind, or even with curiosity. The Church declares that which she knows well and rejoices in. She brings it forth from her treasures. She confesses it. She prays it. She gives thanks for it. She eats and drinks it. She lives by it. She finds in it the Life by which she lives, has lived and will continue to live. This brings us to the very characteristic of the worship of the Christian fellowship: *It is the joyous* APPROPRIATION *of the word of God in faith.*

We have adverted to the significance of the fact that the word of God is declared in our worship not as a record of the past, but by an assembly of confessors of the Name of Christ. They are assembled in His Name, and by virtue of His promise. They appeal to the faithfulness of His word. His word makes their act real, guaranteeing the presence of Christ with them. In their worship "in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" they have fellowship with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ, as well as with one another.

In an older time, when the sacerdotal theory prevailed, the Service was introduced by an act of confession and mutual absolution on the prrt of the clergy, who thus washed their hands in innocence, in order to approach God's altar. The essential truth of this confession is retained in our service, when the whole congregation of "priests unto God," about to offer Him a seasonable service, make confession of sin and appropriate His declaration of grace. Claiming a promise, they receive its gift, and go forward to the central mystery of worship cleansed by the Blood of Jesus Christ and clad in His righteousness.

As the Lord bade His disciples preach throughout the world the Forgiveness of Sins, the Absolution resounds in every part of the Service. It is the warrant of admission to it. It is the

outcome of the Atoning Sacrifice on which it is based. It is the door, the riven veil, through which we enter the Holy of Holies. If, for instance, in the *Kyrie* we put ourselves before God in inarticulate supplication, the *Gloria in Excelsis* is the song of the angels telling us anew that unto us is born a Saviour. The whole service is interwoven of such supplication and such answer giving us far more than we can ask or think.

It is the peculiarity of the Collect that it bases a prayer on an Attribute of God or some particular word of His, and asks for the very thing it promises and bids us pray for. The prayer is prompted by the Word, is borne by the Word, and by the Word is answered. As the Lord's Prayer is at the same time our petition and God's answer to it, so are the Collects. In them we do most assuredly take to ourselves and use the Word of God.

So when the Scriptures are read, they are not only set about with reverent prayers and thanksgivings, but in answer we confess the truth they tell by our repetition of the Creed;—not a fragment of the blessed word is suffered to be lost, but we gather it up.

The General Prayer of the Congregation is based on the Lessons and Sermon, on the total gift of God's word at that particular service, just as the Collect is on the word it pleads. What has been said of the Collect, applies to it.

And when we come to the Holy Communion, not even those who profess to empty it of its meaning have been able to escape the conviction of its reality. There the followers of Jesus repeat to Him in prayer His own words of Institution, His own promise and gift, His own bidding that they should do this till He come, and in virtue of that word are assured of His presence, of the gift of His Body and His Blood, of His absolution of each. They come at His invitation, and plead this as the whole warrant of their act, and He sups with them and they sup with Christ.

From beginning to end the Service is real; a real communion of the body of Christ, and of each member of it in particular, with our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and this, not by virtue

of the proclamation of His Word, but through the *appropriation* of it in faith.

NOTE.—By correct liturgical tradition the words of Institution are said as a prayer to Christ. In virtue of this word we take the Elements and the minister distributes them, and we hold this word before Him in confident prayer for its fulfilment according to His command and promise. This command and promise are the token of our admission to the Holy Supper of our Lord.

1. The words of Institution are not found in the Clementine Liturgy.

2. The Formula of Concord (664, 5) requires that the words of Institution in the Holy Supper should be intelligibly and distinctly sung or said publicly before the assembled people, and not in any wise omitted. * * "The command of Christ, This do, which embraces the whole action of the sacrament, must be presented whole and inviolate. To this pertains that, in a Christian assembly, bread and wine be taken, blessed, distributed, received, eaten, drunk, and that the death of the Lord be thereby shown forth; just as St. Paul puts before our eyes the whole action, 1 Cor. 10."

3. Chemnitz says (Ex. 362) "Therefore in our Lord's Supper the words of Institution are recited not only historically, but that it may be shown to the Church that Christ Himself through His word according to His own commandment and promise is present and by the power of His word extends to those who eat, His own Body and His own Blood. For it is He who distributes, though it be through the minister: He it is who says, This is my Body: He it is who through this word of His brings it to pass that the bread becomes Body and wine His Blood. In this way we are certified and believe that in the Supper of the Lord we partake not of common bread and a common cup, but of the Body and Blood of the Lord."

4. Let us examine the directions of the Lutheran Church Orders on this point. It is to be borne in mind that they were occasioned by the Roman use of singing the words in the Latin tongue, with face turned from the people, in an undertone as *secreta*, the notion being that thus said by the priest they effected the transmutation of the elements.

1523 *Form. Missae* directed that the words be so recited that they may be heard by those standing near. The *Strassburg Kirchenampt* involves the words with the preceding prayer and recites them as an address to God. They are succeeded by a confession of God's goodness to us in the Sacrament, in that it certifies that we are really His children so that "We may freely pray as Thine Only-begotten Son has taught us, saying, &c." The Bavarian *Agendbüchlein*, 1717, (Veit Dietrich) directs that the words be said *Towards the Altar*. *Erbach* and *Breub*. Before the Altar, turned to the people, loud and clear. *Hesse*, 1526, In the vulgar tongue. *Brunswick*, 1528, "We ought to read and sing in German and the Sacrament should be said so as to be heard."

Goslar, 1531, "Thereupon read Dr. Luther's Exhortation to the people, and the Lord's Prayer, and the words of the Supper." *Wittenberg*, 1533, The priest prays the Lord's Prayer for the whole congregation, and consecrates for the communicants with such song as follows: *Lord's Prayer*—Choir answers *Amen.* The Presbyter then takes the bread in his hands, *Our Lord—in remembrance of me.* Here he holds the Sacrament up as is yet customary with us. *After the same manner —in remembrance of me.* Here he elevates the cup, according to our usage. *Liegnitz*, 1534, Exhortation, Preface, in which shall be included the words of our Lord concerning the Supper. *Cassel*, 1539, "Therefore pray with me the Lord's Prayer, as Christ Jesus our Lord taught us to do. * * * Now hear with upright hearts and true faith the word of the Supper." *Saxon*, 1539, In German. *Ref. Col.*, 1543, *Amen* said after the words. *Prussia*, 1544, "Hereupon the priest turns to the altar and begins the Benediction or Consecration immediately in the words of Institution *in nota praefationis.*" Höfling says, (121) Pomeranian: The Priest sings the *verba coenae* as well as the preceding Lord's Prayer with his face turned to the altar. This holds of Nordheim, Herz. Heinrich, Mecklenburg, Wittenberg, Pomern, Brunswick, Niedersächs, Oldenburg, Eisleben, Electoral Saxony, Coburg, Weimar, Hildburghausen, Nassau, 1576, Nördlingen." "*Andorf* and *Friedb.* have "Over the paten." *Augsburg Agendb'lein* with prefatory words treats it as a biblical lection. So *Frankfort*, *Friedberg*, *Strasburg*, *Hannover*, *Schw. Halle*, 1771.

Austria, 1571 Verba, *turned to the people*, holding each element in turn.

5. Kliefoth, (v. 110) says, "The recitation of the words of Institution is, as we have seen, not a sermon or an announcement, but says that His word is held up before the Lord that He may do according to it. Rightly therefore the great majority of the Orders have arranged that the words of Institution like the Lord's Prayer shall be said towards the altar."

We have thus considered the Word of God in Christian Worship, What it is, How it is imparted, and How it is appropriated. The declaration of the Gospel and the thankful acceptance of it are the two elements of the real worship of God. The Roman Catholic Church has departed from this conception, and, having accepted and consecrated the errors which paganism brought into the Church, has turned her worship into the offering of a propitiatory sacrifice. She repeats the Old Testament. I cannot but think that most writers on the Anglican Service have erred in persistently overlooking the Protestant,

the Lutheran elements in it, which give it such worth, and in seeking a commentary upon it in mediæval and older writers instead of the teaching of the reformers, from whom its intelligible and consistent elements were derived. They seek to explain it as a sacrifice, and to do so invent theories of sacrifice, instead of recognizing in Christian Worship the Church's declaration and appropriation of the regenerative Word of God.

ARTICLE VI.

THE DAY OF PENTECOST. ACTS II.

By Professor Eli Huber, D. D.

Immediately before his ascension into heaven Jesus promised his disciples that they should be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence. By this baptism they would be endowed with power from on high, whereby they would become qualified to be his witnesses throughout all the world. Till thus equipped for their mission they were not to depart from Jerusalem.

The time of waiting is spent in prayer and in supplication. The day of Pentecost is nigh at hand and it is natural to suppose that they would conclude that the event for which they were looking, would occur in connection with that great feast. And in this they were not disappointed, for when that day had fully come, they were all filled with the Holy Ghost and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance.

The place is the upper room in which they have been in the habit of assembling for religious services. The time is generally taken somewhat indefinitely as some part of the Pentecostal day. A writer in an early volume of the *Expositor*, however, argues quite plausibly in favor of a more definite hour. As it was only nine o'clock when the Apostle Peter was already speaking, and time enough had already elapsed to enable the multitude to gather together and to behold and discuss the wonderful occurrences, he infers that the expression employed means the very beginning of the day, or six o'clock in the morning,

immediately after the fifty days that intervene between the Passover and Pentecost were fulfilled. It is, of course, not a vital question, but it is pleasant to believe that the Holy Spirit came down upon the little company of disciples at the very opening of the day. But whilst time and place are circumstances that need to be noticed, still, the event that occurred then and there is the great thing that claims our attention. The advent of the Holy Ghost, and the taking up of his abode in the hearts of the disciples, this constitutes the true wonder of the day. Let it then be the subject for consideration in this article, and in discussing it, it will be found convenient to gather the material relating to it, under the following heads :

I. The gift of the Spirit in respect to the accompanying phenomena.

II. The gift of the Spirit in respect to the source from which it emanated.

III. The gift of the Spirit in respect to the condition necessary to its reception.

IV. The gift of the Spirit in respect to its effect upon the life of the Church.

I. Let us consider the gift of the Holy Ghost in respect to the accompanying phenomena. These are very properly regarded as signs in relation to the wonderful event in connection with which they occurred. They were given for the purpose of assuring the minds of the disciples that the baptism, for which they were praying and waiting, had indeed been bestowed. They had been instructed not to go out on their mission of testifying for Jesus, until they had received the necessary fitness through the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. In order, therefore, that they may enter upon their arduous work with courage and bear their testimony with confidence, they must be made free from all uncertainty as to whether they have received the promised baptism, and have been equipped with the requisite power from on high. The signs bestowed were undoubtedly intended to serve this purpose, and we know from subsequent history that the end for which they were designed was accomplished. After this day, it was never a question with them whether or not they

had received the gift of the Holy Spirit which Jesus had promised.

These signs, however, were not given merely for the sake of the disciples, but also for the benefit of the vast multitude of people now assembled in Jerusalem. Their attention must be drawn to this important occurrence, their interest excited, and their minds constrained to inquire into the meaning of what they had seen and heard. That they had this desired effect is evident from the narrative.

The signs under consideration are three in number; a sound of a rushing mighty wind, cloven tongues as of fire, and the speaking in unknown languages.

The first addresses itself to the sense of hearing. It is a sound, suddenly occurring, proceeding from heaven, like the rushing noise of a powerful wind, filling the house in which they were gathered together, and reaching even beyond, to the vast multitude with which the holy city was filled at this time.

The second sign presents itself to the sense of sight. It has the appearance of tongues like as of fire, parting asunder, and alighting upon each of the disciples.

The third and last is a sign for the understanding rather, a speaking with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance. The plain meaning of this evidently is, that these persons were enabled to speak of the wonderful works of God in languages which they had not learned before. From the list of nationalities represented, the number of such languages must have been considerable—probably, as some think, six or eight distinct languages and various dialects in addition.

The meaning of these wonderful manifestations is differently understood by different parties witnessing them. The sound having been heard at some distance from the spot whence it proceeded, arrests the attention of the crowd, excites their curiosity and causes them to rush in haste to the place to see what it meant. The number thus congregating is large, comprising devout men from every nation under heaven. But as they reach the spot where they expected to find out the cause of the strange sound that had come to their ears, another and yet

greater wonder appears unto them, and throws them into complete mental confusion, "because that every man heard them speaking in his own language." The speakers, surely, are all Galileans, and yet "we hear every man in our own language wherein we were born." They are amazed—they are filled with wonder—but they do not know what to make of it—they can see no cause that accounts for the effect they behold. In their perplexity they go from one to another, saying, What meaneth this? They are at their wits end—completely confounded.

There are others present, however, who find no difficulty in explaining the mystery. It is a very easy case. The men are simply full of new wine. The persons who thus judge may be animated by a hostile spirit, may be superficial in thought, or frivolous in character, but, however this may be, one thing is certain, their explanation is a very unreasonable one, as St. Peter presently proceeds to point out.

At this juncture St. Peter standing up with the eleven lifts up his voice and asks all present to hearken to him as he gives his view of the meaning of the things that so perplex them. He at once and emphatically rejects the explanation that ascribes the wonders they behold to the influence of new wine. These men are not drunken as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day. It is only nine o'clock and before that time no Jew that has any respect for himself eats or drinks anything at all. Till the morning sacrifice has been offered, he abstains from both food and drink. It is not usual even for regular drunkards to be the worse for liquor by day; they that be drunken are drunken in the night, says St. Paul. The mere mention of the hour of the day is in the judgment of Peter sufficient to satisfy all present that the charge of drunkenness does not account for the mystery they are seeking to solve.

Having thus summarily refuted the charge that these men were under the influence of strong drink, he proceeds at some length to explain the cause of all that they have seen and heard that day, and by which they have been so utterly confounded. "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; and it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out

my spirit on all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions and your old men shall dream dreams, and on my servants and on my handmaidens, I will pour out in those days of my Spirit, and they shall prophesy." The passage thus quoted by Peter is found in Joel 1 : 28–32 and is embraced in our chapter in 17–21. Whatever it was that Joel said would happen in these last days, that according to Peter has now come to pass, and these wonderful manifestations are a sign and a testimony thereof.

The prophecy speaks concerning the Spirit of God—that it is to be imparted in a hitherto unheard of measure; bestowed, not upon a special class only or on a limited number, but upon all flesh, without distinction of age, sex, or station in life. Those who receive him shall behold visions and dream dreams—the usual mediae through which God revealed his will to his prophets. Having thus come into possession of the thoughts and intentions of the Almighty, they were enabled to prophesy and thus reveal to others what they had learned from God.

This outpouring of the Spirit of God upon the hearts of men, is to be followed by the judgment of the Lord against the ungodly heathen world, yea, against every power that opposes itself to the purposes of Jehovah. This may mean, in the first instance, the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Jewish nation, and then, later on, that of the Roman Empire, and, in its widest sense, the overthrow of one heathen people after another till every high thing that exalteth itself against the kingdom of Christ shall have been cast down.

The Church by the power of the Spirit and of prophetic vision perceives the meaning of the tokens in the heavens and the earth, and knows that the judgment is approaching; sounds the note of warning to the world, and itself flees from the impending ruin, for "whosoever calleth on the name of the Lord shall be saved." Thus by the action of the Spirit of God within the hearts of men, by the prophetic testimony of the Church, and by the destruction of all hostile powers without, the sanctification and glorification of the heavenly kingdom shall be

brought about, and the salvation of mankind become an accomplished fact.

Now this very thing that was foretold by the prophet Joel hundreds of years before, has been fulfilled this day, in the events of Pentecost. Not in the sense that all that is embraced in the prediction has already come to pass, but in the sense that the Spirit has come down upon the Church and will continue with her and work in and through her, until all God's purposes of grace are accomplished.

II. *The gift of the Spirit in respect to the source from which it emanates.* Having now established a connection between these Pentecostal signs and the gift of the Holy Ghost, he next goes on to trace the gift itself to the risen, and exalted Saviour, Jesus Christ, "who has shed forth this which ye now see and hear." As the sound, and flame, and unknown tongue are signs and evidences that the Spirit has been given, so the fact that the Spirit has been given, in its turn, becomes a sign of the exaltation of Jesus to be both Lord and Christ. How he connects the man of Nazareth with the baptism of the Holy Ghost, will become manifest by a careful consideration of the passages extending from verse 22 to 36.

He begins with Jesus as an individual. That such a person did appear among the children of Israel a short time before no one will question.

Claiming to have been sent from God on a special mission to the earth, he is accredited by God himself. He is true and faithful—"my Son in whom I am well pleased. Hear ye him." His approval was made manifest by miracles and wonders and signs which God did by him, as they themselves well knew. That miracles were wrought was not a matter of debate between the speaker and his hearers. That these were testimonials to Christ from God—St. Peter asserts—and is thus in agreement with the utterance of Nicodemus—"We know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do the miracles that thou doest except God be with him." This much then is settled, Jesus of Nazareth is a man approved and accred-

ited of God. Over against this, however, stands the fact that Jesus was put to death. "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." This was a great stumbling block to the whole Jewish nation, and the arguments implied therein had to be constantly met in the preaching of the Gospel. His being put to death involved the idea of condemnation by the religious teachers and rulers of the land, rejection by God himself and an inconsistency with prophecy which according to their understanding taught that the Messiah should not die at all, but abide forever. But whatever objections might be derived from the fact of his death, they are all refuted by the other fact of his resurrection. That God raised him from the dead was the triumphant answer to all adverse arguments that were ever based upon his crucifixion. Paul certainly was in accord with Peter as to the value of the fact of the resurrection of our Lord, in answering objections based upon the condemnation and death of Jesus; for in the synagogue at Thessalonica we find him, for three successive Sabbath days, reasoning with the Jews out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging that it behooved the Christ to suffer, and to rise again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom I proclaim unto you, is the Christ.

The resurrection of Jesus being so important as an argument in the establishment of his claims against unbelievers, the apostle realizes the necessity of proving the resurrection itself beyond all doubt. That which is to be the corner-stone in the great temple of gospel truth must itself be most securely laid.

To prove the assertion he has made that God raised up Jesus whom they crucified, he claims that it was not possible that he should be holden of death, because David, who is himself a prophet, spake of the resurrection of the Christ, that his soul was not left in Hades, nor did his flesh see corruption. The portion of Scripture, from which the whole prediction is taken, is the sixteenth Psalm, verses 8–11, and is found in our chapter in verses 25–28.

In this passage David expresses himself as follows: "There-

fore did my heart rejoice and my tongue was glad; moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope, because thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption." Having quoted the Psalmist's language, the apostle gives his own interpretation thereof, and states definitely to whom this declaration, in its true and full sense, is applicable. *Not to David*, "for he is both dead and buried and his sepulchre is with us unto this day." Of him it cannot be said that he has arisen from the dead. This accords entirely with St. Paul's declaration on this same subject: "For David after he had served his own generation by the will of God, fell on sleep and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption; but he whom God raised again saw no corruption."

David, then, did not say this concerning himself, but concerning the Messiah. David is himself a prophet, and he knows that of the fruit of his own loins according to the flesh, God will raise up one to sit on his throne. Foreseeing this, therefore, he spake of the resurrection of the Christ, that his soul was not left in Hades, neither did his flesh see corruption. This, then, settles the question as to the person whose resurrection is foretold by the 16th Psalm. It is not David but Christ.

But as the word "Christ" is now very commonly used in a personal as well as an official sense, we must guard against mistake in summing up what Peter has thus far established from the prophet David. He has not yet proved that the Christ, whose resurrection is spoken of, is identical with the man Jesus of Nazareth. He has only shown that the Messiah, foretold by prophecy, shall be raised from the dead. This one mark any man must have who proposes to lay claims to the Messiahship. Who the individual is, that possesses this characteristic, is not decided in the Psalm under consideration. But Peter himself supplies what is yet wanting to complete the argument in favor of Jesus—when he makes the bold, unequivocal assertion, "This Jesus has God raised up whereof we all are witnesses."

Elsewhere St. Paul affirms the same facts. "God raised him from the dead," and appeals for confirmation to the same persons, as he adds, "and he was seen many days of them which

came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are his witnesses unto the people."

Let us stop for a moment and see just where we stand in this discussion. From David we gather that the Christ when he comes shall bear this mark—that he has been raised up from the dead and was not suffered to see corruption. From Peter, supported by the other apostles, we learn that the individual, called Jesus, has been so raised up. We know, moreover, that he is the only one who has come forth from the grave without afterward seeing corruption. We are constrained, therefore, to conclude that Jesus is the Messiah—the Christ. Thus then we find ourselves in possession of two most important facts concerning Jesus—his resurrection from the dead and his Messiahship—Jesus has arisen—Jesus is the Christ.

Having now established these two facts, he takes a step forward in the discussion of his subject and assures his hearers that this same man was also exalted by the right hand of God. It reads as though it were a summary of all that had thus far been proved, or a conclusion to which he had come in the course of the argument—"therefore being by the right hand of God exalted." But the fact is he has not brought us thus far as yet. He has indeed raised him up from the grave, but he has not yet lifted him up into the heavens. The explanation of the seeming inconsistency is found in the fact that the resurrection of of Jesus, which he has proved, involves the exaltation of which he speaks. This exaltation embraces two things, the ascension into heaven, and the sitting on the right hand of God entrusted with all power and authority. This is evident from what is said in the 34th and 35th verses taken from the 110th Psalm. Some one, as is implied in the exaltation previously spoken of, has ascended into the heavens; but it is not David himself, but David's Lord, to whom it is further said,'' "Sit thou on my right hand until I make thy foes thy footstool;" or in the language of St. Paul, "he shall reign until he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power."

Another step in advance is thus again taken. Jesus has risen —ascended—and sits on the throne at the right hand of power;

His mediatorial reign has begun—and now he receives the promised gift of the Holy Ghost from the Father—and having received it himself, he gave it to his disciples as he had engaged to do. "He hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear." Thus the apostle connects the wonderful events of Pentecost with the man Christ Jesus—now exalted to be the Saviour of the world and made Lord of heaven and earth. This certainly is in accord with what Jesus himself had said: "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send him unto you." For the fact that the Holy Spirit has come down upon the disciples, because of the influence and interposition of Jesus with his Father, we depend, primarily, upon the statement of the apostle here made, but his declaration finds easy and full confirmation in the many utterances of Scripture on the subject. The Old Testament prophets hundreds of years before the Christian era, foretold the advent of the Spirit. Jesus while on earth and especially toward the end of his life, again and again, comforts his disciples by the promise of the Holy Ghost. When he goes away to him that sent him, the Comforter shall come. Just before his ascension he fixes the time more nearly—not many days hence; wait for it in Jerusalem. Having spoken thus, he was taken up and a cloud received him out of their sight. With the eye they can see no further, but two men in white apparel suddenly appear and tell them that Jesus is taken up from them into heaven. Only ten days after, the wonderful manifestations of Pentecost take place. How could they avoid the conclusion, Jesus has done this, has sent his Spirit, and shed forth this which ye now see and hear. To Jesus, then, as cause and giver we must ascribe the outpouring of the Holy Ghost.

Peter having now proved the resurrection and Messiahship of Jesus, and his exaltation to the throne of the heavenly kingdom, with unlimited authority and power, sums up in verse 36 all that he has thus far established concerning him and affirms with great emphasis, "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye crucified, both Lord and Christ."

These two terms—or their equivalents in chap. 5 : 31, Prince and Saviour—stand for much and very important truth in respect to Jesus. Knowing what they denote, we know the work and place of the Son of God in the kingdom of heaven.

On this account they are deserving of the most careful consideration. And let it be borne in mind that the place and power represented by them are the appointment of God. Jesus has not lifted himself into the high position; nor has he been put there by any effort of man. God alone has made him Lord and Christ.

The term *Christ* indicates the office he fills. It is the Greek word corresponding to the Hebrew Messiah. Both mean anointed, with reference to the Old Testament mode of inducting priest or king into office. As applied to Jesus it means that he has been chosen to a position of great dignity and power, but it does not in itself designate what it is. From Scripture declarations, however, we learn that he has been anointed prophet, priest and king, to reveal God's will, atone for sin, and reign over his people. The purpose for which he has been thus appointed is to save the world from sin and bring the human race, now in a state of insubordination, into a state of obedience to the divine law. To the attainment of this end he must do two things—make atonement for sin by the sacrifice of himself and then so change the mind, heart and will of the sinner that he he will honestly turn away from all evil and yield prompt, and hearty obedience to all that God may command. This is the grand benevolent purpose of the office to which he has been anointed.

The enterprise he has thus entered upon is vast beyond our ability fully to conceive. It covers ages as to time—embraces all nations and all individuals thereof. Has to deal with characters of every kind—with men ignorant, stupid, debased, obstinate, always resisting the Holy Ghost. He who has ever seriously tried to convert a single sinner and hold him in the way of obedience subsequently, may have some faint idea of what Jesus took in hand when he came to save the world—but eternity alone can fully reveal all that is implied therein.

God has, however, made him Lord as well as Christ. As the Messiah, his office is to take away the sin of the world. To this end he must have a corresponding measure of authority and power—and the term Lord indicates that he is entrusted with both. Whatever authority is needful to accomplish the purpose contemplated in his appointment as Saviour, is undoubtedly conferred upon him; and to the authority is added an adequate degree of power to make it effective against all opposition.

How much authority and how much power he has been entrusted with, may be best understood by a careful consideration of the various Scripture declarations on the subject.

In the 28th chapter of St. Matthew, the blessed Master himself, before commanding the twelve to make all the nations his disciples, justifies the requirement by the bold assertion, "all power is given to me in heaven and on earth." The new version has "authority" in place of "power," but the two ideas are included in the word employed in the original. The declaration made is unqualified and denotes absolute, unlimited authority and power. In 1 Peter 3 : 22, the author having referred to the resurrection of Jesus Christ, adds the following, "who is gone into heaven and is on the right hand of God; angels, and authorities and powers being made subject unto him." All these beings, whether belonging exclusively to the heavenly world, or embracing earthly inhabitants and governments likewise, are under the control of Jesus and at his disposal for whatever services he may required of them.

St. Paul in Ephesians 1 : 19–23 is especially strong and comprehensive. He speaks here of the working of God's mighty power which he wrought in Christ, "when he raised him from the dead and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all."

The language here used is simply overwhelming. It seats Jesus at the right hand of God in the heavenly places—in a

position in the universe higher than all created dignities what ever their station or rank. In trying to afford some aid in the consideration of this most wonderful passage, we will avail ourselves of the words of an able and thoughtful commentator on this Epistle: "The highest position in creation is yet beneath Christ. Some of the beings that occupy those stations have specific and appropriate names, but not only above these, but above every conceivable office and being, Jesus is immeasurably exalted. There is no exception; he has no equal and no superior, not simply among those with whose titles we are acquainted, but in the wide universe there is no name so high as his, and among all its spheres, there is no renown that matches his. These principalities stand around and beneath the throne, but Jesus sits at its right hand." As to the different ranks of angels here spoken of, the same writer adds—"All that we know is that there is foundation for the main idea—that there is no dull and sating uniformity among the inhabitants of heaven—that order and freedom are not inconsistent with gradation of rank—that there are glory and a higher glory—power and a nobler power—rank and a loftier rank, to be witnessed in the mighty scale. As there are orbs of dazzling radiance amidst the paler and humbler stars of the sky, so there are bright and majestic chieftains among the hosts of God, nearer God in position, and liker God in majesty, possessing and reflecting more of the divine splendor, than their lustrous brethren around them. But above all Jesus is enthroned—the highest position in the universe is his. The Seraph who adores and beams nearest the eternal throne is only *next to him*, but *next by a vast interval.*"

These several passages certainly do teach us that the very highest possible measure of power has been given into the hands of Jesus—that he is at liberty to use all the material and all the spiritual forces in the universe to enable him to carry out the great purpose for which he has been appointed. Whatever power we find in the elements of nature, whatever is possessed and represented by human governments; whatever is in the hands of angels that excel in strength, all are subject to him and can be employed by him as the interests of salvation may

demand. Could we but comprehend in any considerable part the tremendous agencies Christ is warranted and enabled to control, it would give us a far more exalted idea of the greatness of the salvation of the Gospel than we have ever had before. We would no longer be able to hold it in light esteem but glorying in it as did the Apostle Paul, we would with him exclaim, "I am not ashamed of the Gospel, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."

III. *The gift of the Spirit in respect to the conditions necessary to its reception.* Under the influence of the Divine Spirit the effect of Peter's discourse upon his hearers was powerful. When they heard this, they were pricked in their hearts—or pierced, to use the word employed elsewhere to denote the wound made in the side of Christ by the soldier's spear. They are in deep distress of mind. Their conscience smites them sorely. They realize the meaning of what they in their ignorance and unbelief have done. They have rendered themselves guilty before God in the condemnation and crucifixion of his own Son. Yea, they have committed the unheard of folly of rejecting the very one for whose advent they were waiting and praying—their own Redeemer and King—the hope and consolation of Israel. Like patients suffering under some fatal disease, they have slain the one physician that had power to heal them. They have thrown away their only chance for deliverance. They are in great perplexity of mind and in their despair they turn to Peter and the rest of the apostles and earnestly ask, Men, brethren what shall we do?

The answer to this question is prompt, clear, and full of hope; Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.

The words "unto the remission of sins" point out an end which they must keep in view, strive after, and attain unto, in order that they may be saved. They have sinned and must be forgiven, they have offended God and must become reconciled. There is no alternative in the case—they must come into a

state of justification before God—they must have peace with him through our Lord Jesus Christ—and in order to this they must obtain the forgiveness of their sins.

We now have the end to be gained. The means thereunto are repentance and baptism in the name of Jesus Christ. Repent and be baptized every one of you for the remission of sins. Repent, change your mind, your views, feelings and purposes in general, but especially in regard to Jesus. You looked upon him as a deceiver of the people, making claims that could not be substantiated. You declared him a blasphemer and judged him to be worthy of death, and having thus condemned him you delivered him into the hands of the Gentiles to be crucified and slain. In all this you were mistaken. In spite of his condemnation before your highest tribunal, it turns out after all that your verdict was false, and that he was what he claimed to be—a messenger from heaven—the King of Israel—the Redeemer of the world. Recognize and confess that you were wrong Undo as far as possible the mistake that you made—by now admitting that his claims were righteous—and acknowledging and accepting him as your Lord and Saviour. All this you may confess and do by one single act—baptism in Christ's name. For whoever consents to receive Christian baptism says thereby, I believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Saviour of the world; and I agree hereby to own and accept him as such. I also believe that he is Lord in heaven and on earth, and I do hereby solemnly pledge myself to do whatever he tells me and observe all things he has commanded me through his apostles.

To all who comply with these requirements—doing what is involved in repentance and baptism—he gives the assurance that they shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. By repentance and the faith in Jesus, included in and expressed by baptism, they have obtained the forgiveness of sins and consequently are now in a state of reconciliation toward God. And being reconciled there is nothing to separate between them and their God—and no reason any longer exists for the withholding of any, even the best and greatest of God's blessings, the gift of the Holy Ghost. Not, that the repentance and the faith and

pledge of obedience involved in baptism, are an equivalent for the gift that is promised, but they constitute a state of mind in man which justifies God in taking up his abode in him by the presence of his Holy Spirit. There is a difference between the bestowment of the Spirit and any other gifts which God might desire to impart. The latter are of an external character and do not involve the close union and the intimate fellowship implied in giving himself by his Spirit. God can without impropriety, without any reflection upon his moral character, show any favor however great to any man however degraded—but he cannot give himself in the high sense involved in the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, to any man not reconciled to him by repentance and faith in Jesus Christ. This holds also between the gift of the Spirit as dwelling within us, and the gift of the same Spirit as a mere external influence.

To encourage them to believe so wonderful a promise, and to justify himself in making it, he reminds them of the fact that this very blessing is guaranteed to them in their own scriptures —"for the promise is to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, as many as the Lord our God shall call." Let them but comply with the terms laid down by the apostle and the gift of the Spirit will be sure to follow—and to this compliance Peter urges them with all earnestness, for with many other words did he testify and exhort, saying, Save yourselves from this untoward generation. These "other words" may mean that having delivered the one discourse with the foregoing facts and thoughts, he added another in which he still further testified and exhorted—or that there was but one discourse, and in that one many other things were said by way of testimony and persuasion that are not recorded in our chapter. But however this may be, it is evident in either view, that St. Peter was concerned not only that they should know what they must do to be saved, but that knowing, they should make practical use of their knowledge and take such immediate action as would result in salvation. To secure the desired action he does the two things here spoken of—testifies and exhorts; employing "testimony, argument, and solemn affirmation" on the one hand—"summon-

ing, commanding, and persuading" on the other. His first aim is to beget faith in Jesus as the Christ, and in order to do this he furnishes all needful testimony, no doubt at the same time noting and refuting any objections that might be presented. But he aims at faith not as an end, but as a means. He must establish conviction in order that he may induce action. But this done, he does not rest there, but brings all possible pressure to bear upon them to constrain them to take such steps as will result in their salvation. Peter calls into requisition, all his power of reason and all power of will, to rouse his hearers to the effort necessary to secure deliverance from sin and destruction. Nor were his arguments and appeals in vain; many received his word, believed in Jesus, were baptized in his name and obtained forgiveness of sin and the gift of the Holy Ghost. The number thus added to the disciples was about three thousand souls. These new converts no longer holding with that crooked generation that Jesus was not the Messiah, would naturally turn away from them as being no longer in sympathy with them, and having now one Lord, one faith and one baptism with the friends of Jesus, they would just as naturally join themselves to them. Such a course is always a result and an evidence of the repentance and faith here enjoined by St. Peter; and it is an unfavorable indication when a professed believer finds no satisfaction in the society of Christians but feels perfectly at home in the company of those who make light of the things of Christ.

IV. *The Gift of the Spirit in respect to its effect upon the life of the Church.*

The account of the events of the day of Pentecost ends with the 41st verse; but from the few brief statements made at the end of the chapter we are enabled to gather a right good idea of the course these new converts afterwards pursued, and thereby, of the effect of the presence and operation of the Spirit. "*They continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship and in breaking of bread and in prayers.*" They did not cease to attend the instruction of the apostles, after baptism, but gathered around them habitually and earnestly, just as the twelve had done around their Master that they might

have the benefit of his teaching. They wanted to know more of the Saviour whom they had just accepted and gladly availed themselves of every opportunity for further information as to what he had said and done during his ministry.

They continued in fellowship also as well as in the teaching of the apostles. That is, they maintained constant brotherly associations with one another. Being of one mind and of one heart they were drawn together into a brotherhood of the closest character. The love that thus bound them together expressed itself in the "breaking of bread and in prayers." "The breaking of bread" refers to their custom of holding common evening meals which were attended by all the disciples. Those who were blessed with abundance, furnished the provisions necessary for these social repasts, and the poor as well as the rich partook thereof. What was left after all had eaten was at the service of the needy and could be carried by them to their own homes. These meals ended, after the example of Jesus at the last Passover, in the Lord's Supper. Thus the *fellowship* here spoken of would indicate itself in these social meals—in the gifts distributed thereat—in the observance of the Lord's Supper and in social prayers.

The next statement shows the effect produced upon all the people—"*Fear came upon every soul.*" A feeling of solemnity and veneration and awe lays hold of the whole community as well as of the Christians themselves. It was the natural product of a vivid sense of the divine presence in their midst. God had manifested himself wonderfully in all that had happened recently amongst them. The large number that had accepted Jesus as Messiah; their diligent attendance upon the means of grace; the spirit of love and benevolence; the occurrences in connection with the gift of the Holy Ghost; the miracles still performed by the apostles; had an unearthly impressiveness and begat the fear spoken of above. This state of mind in the community served as a protection to the infant Church and favored the work of the Spirit and the spread of the Gospel. "*And all that believed were together and had all things common.*" There is a sense of oneness and of brotherliness that results from their common relation to Christ. A brother

with abundance of this world's goods cannot possibly shut his bowels of compassion against a brother that is in destitution. Besides, we are told that not one of them said that aught of the things he possessed was his own. It is easy to see that such brotherly affection, and such sense of stewardship in respect to property would lead them to do just what they did, use what they owned for the welfare of all—selling their possessions and goods and distributing to all as every man had need.

What has been said so far has been said of them, not as Jews, but as Christians or believers. But in verse 47 we have a more general statement, giving a sort of summary of all they did after their baptism. They continued daily with one accord in the temple, worshiping as they had done before and as all the other Jews did who did not yet acknowledge the Messiahship of Jesus. Along with those services which were common to the disciples with the Jews, they also continued to break bread in fixed and separate assemblies—eating together in places of their own and concluding their meals as before with the Eucharist. Attending thus to all their religious duties—they ate their meat with gladness and singleness of heart. Thus rejoicing in God and full of brotherly love, they were habitually in a state of mind that inclined them to praise the Lord and enabled them to find favor with the people.

Under circumstances such as are here described, it is not a matter of surprise that the membership of the Church should grow constantly and regularly. "*And the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved.*" The hand of the Lord is in the accessions. It is he that gives the increase. The persons thus added are described as the saved or those in process of salvation. Such are added to the other believers. This indicates the judgment of Jesus as to what to do with men who are in the way of salvation—bring them into the fellowship of the saints—add them to the Church of Christ.

ARTICLE VII.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

Christian Worship. Ten Lectures delivered in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. pp. 338. $1.50.

This work is a sign of the times and a book for the times. The non-liturgical churches of America are confronted by a sudden revolution in the conduct of public worship and how to meet this revolution is the question of the hour. The wide-awake authorities of Union Seminary conceived a happy idea when, through one of their generous Directors, they provided last Autumn for a Course of Lectures on this subject in that Institution, from ten representatives of seven religious denominations. And now the Christian public is favored with these Lectures in a printed form, a volume which will be found to be as timely as it is instructive and interesting.

That representatives of the Episcopal, Lutheran, Reformed Presbyterian, Baptist and Congregational bodies, should present as they do here a substantial unity of sentiment on the conduct of public worship is itself a most impressive and suggestive phenomenon, especially when one recalls how this very subject was a prominent factor in the historic separation of some of these bodies from each other. No wonder that the general revival of interest in the ordering of worship, aided as it is by the tendency to uniformity, is viewed by many of these Lecturers as a movement destined to powerfully promote the cause of church unity. They see that "amidst the doctrinal divisions and governmental conflicts of eighteen centuries, and beneath the almost infinite variations of ritual, there has been maintained, throughout the Christian society, presumably by the intervention and care of the Holy Spirit, a practically universal adherence to those elements of worship which form the apostolic and fundamental contents of the institution." "It would be the ideal of worship," says Dr. Hastings, "if all Christians of all denominations could be outwardly one at least in song and prayer. Thus on the one hand might be avoided the danger which freedom in public worship involves, and on the other hand the danger which fixedness in public worship involves. The ideal must be the combination or the interblending of the two methods, the liturgical and the non-liturgical. * * * Then and thus the real oneness of all believers would be proclaimed and emphasized; then and thus the churches which differ in polity or in doctrine would be visibly one before the throne of grace."

Invaluable as are the contributions to this volume from those repre-

senting liturgical churches—and the Lecture by Dr. Jacobs on the Lutheran Liturgies is exceptionally so—the chief interest to the reviewer is found in the utterances of the Congregational, Presbyterian and Baptist representatives. The keynote with all of these is the priesthood of believers, sustained by the unassailable logic, that the part taken by worshipers must be coextensive with this priesthood. "Worship is a primary function, * * worship distinctively regarded as service collectively rendered unto God; common prayer, common praise, common liturgical and sacramental usage."

Among these same representatives there is a general lament over the neglect which this primary and momentous subject has received. "Liturgics," says Prof. Smyth, "is at present the least developed department of theological science." What a confession! And what a commentary on the harvest reaped from opposition to fixed forms!

With this confession is very properly united a striking modesty as to the best methods for meeting the demands for "a richer, more expressive, more uplifting Christian worship throughout the Church." No one has the assurance to propose the preparation of new forms. "The important thing is," says Dr. Hastings, "not to add to divisiveness and confusion by *making new* forms. It may not be best that these forms should be taken from the Book of Common Prayer, though this would be my preference; it may be better that they should be compiled from that and also from other existing liturgies." We suggest to the learned Doctor that he emphasize the last clause. The Lutherans are ahead this time, and there are found forms in their Service which, we know, commend themselves unqualifiedly to Congregationalists, Presbyterians and Methodists.

All unite in accentuating the value of the most ancient forms, recognising that it is through these "that the faith of Christ has been conserved upon the earth, rather than through the involved confessional creations that lie dormant in theological literature. * * The Apostles' Creed, the *Gloria Patri*, the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the *Te Deum*, the Nicene Creed, the Words of Institution at the Lord's Supper, have kept the Catholic faith unspotted from the world, unwarped by the Church." Maintaining the principle of freedom in the use of any form, Prof. Smyth justly observes, "It is a poor freedom that cannot use the best." And the best, according to a quotation from Dr. Hitchcock, are the most ancient. "The farther we get down the centuries, the more precious will be to us the long unbroken melodies of praise and prayer." "To the reflective worshiper," says Geo. Dana Boardman, "few things are more inspiring than the sense of joining in strains centuries old."

The endeavor to contribute to the construction of a proper liturgy, on the part of divines to whom this is, in practice at least, a comparatively new field, is a very entertaining study. Sometimes the true scien-

tific mark is hit, sometimes it is missed. Two Presbyterians agree in giving seven elements of worship and their order of sequence.

Dr. Charles Cuthbert Hall sets forth very clearly the true relation of the Creed to the Scriptures: "The word of man should be the echo of the word of God. The heart of man should reply to the outpourings of the heart of God." But both mistake the proper position of the Prayer, placing it before the Teaching, or the Sermon, although they are reminded by another Presbyterian (p. 265) that the long prayer before sermon is "contrary to all the practice of the Church, old or late." Besides, their own views as to the relation of teaching or preaching to worship point conclusively to the Prayer and Oblation as following the Sermon. "Worship," says Dr. Hall, "is ever regarded in the New Testament as an effect of knowledge." "Worship is the expression of faith, but the substance of faith must forever be recruited by growth of knowledge." Dr. Hastings repeats this judgment. "The true object of a Sermon is to feed the fires of devotion, of consecration, and of service." "Instruction feeds the flame of worship, and through it comes that necessary increment of knowledge which is fuel for the altar fire of worship." "The divine giving is, in the Christian scheme of worship, the inspiration of the human giving."

This being so, then surely the proper place for the Prayer and the Oblation is after the Sermon. The very same arguments which fix the Creed, the expression of our faith, after the reading of the Scriptures, fix likewise the offerings of prayer and alms after the flames of devotion have been kindled through instruction from the divine word. The Creed of the congregation is the response to the word read, the alms and prayers of the congregation form the response to the word preached.

Lutherans who may have faint recollections of controversial utterances on worship, will find a point of supreme interest in positions assumed by Presbyterian divines on the relation of the Sermon to the other parts of the service. Luther's dictum: "The greatest and most important part of all the worship of God is the preaching and the teaching of God's word," is condemned as "an extreme." And over against this is quoted the Presbyterian *Directory for Worship*, maintaining it "as one primary design of public ordinances to pay social acts of homage to the most high God," and directing ministers "not to make their sermons so long as to interfere with or exclude the more important duties of prayer and praise." "The Sermon," adds Dr. Hastings, "must not be permitted to subordinate praise and prayer, or the reading of the Word."

On the relative importance of the Sacraments the same divine makes them "constitute the crowning element of worship." He objects to the celebration of the Holy Commu nion at the close of an ordinary service, "unless it can be made the culmination and not the mere hurried

conclusion of such a service." And Dr. Egbert Smyth, whose rank as a historian is beyond question, declares, "This celebration was from the beginning, doubtless, the centre and culmination of the Christian worship."

The critic is trespassing, he realizes it, but a volume so rich in attractions and so full of surprises it is very hard to lay down. For the readers of the QUARTERLY, most of whom have a profound interest in liturgical studies, we volunteer without hesitation, but not without deliberation, the advice, by all means make this inexpensive work your own and loan it to your friends. E. J. W.

The Claims of the Old Testamant. By Stanley Leathes, D. D., Professor of Old Testament Exegesis in King's College, London. pp. 73. $1.00.

Two Lectures on Theism. By Andrew Seth, LL. D., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh. pp. 64. $1.00.

The Descent of the Primates. By A. A. W. Hubrecht, Professor of Zoology in the University of Utrecht. With Illustrations. pp. 41. $1.00.

These are some of the notable lectures delivered at Princeton University during the celebration of the sesquicentennial of that institution. In the whole series there are seven volumes, the other four being Professor Dowden's "French Revolution and English Literature;" Professor Thomson's four lectures on "The Discharge of Electricity in Gases;" Professor Klein on "The Mathematical Theory of the Top;" and Professor Brugmann on "The Nature and Origin of the Noun Genders in the Indogermanic Languages." They constitute a learned and scholarly series well worthy of being published and widely read.

The Builders and Other Poems. By Henry Van Dyke. $1.50.

This beautiful little volume is worthy of the author and the publisher. Dr. Van Dyke showed himself a sympathetic student of poetry in his exposition of Tennyson. He has here showed himself a versifier of no mean merit. From time to time pieces of verse have appeared over his name which revealed a poet's appreciation of nature and a poet's insight into the deeps of the soul. They were the harbingers of the little volume before us, which, slender as it is, shows what we may expect from Dr. Van Dyke in the future. Dr. Van Dyke is a poet—not a great poet, but a true one. He can write a song of nature that breathes the air of outdoor life, of which he is so fond. Any one of the "Songs out of Doors" would establish this, particularly "An Angler's Wish." He catches the bird-notes with a poet's ear. The Academic Ode which gives its title to the volume is an occasional poem, which, while inspired of a fine thought, like most poems of the sort loses much apart from the event it celebrated. The mechanical

work of the book is a triumph of the printer's art and reflects great credit upon the Scribner publishing house. H. C. A.

T. AND T. CLARK, EDINBURG.
Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons.

Life After Death and the Future of the Kingdom of God. By Bishop Lars Nielsen Dahle. Translated from the Norse by the Rev. John Beveridge, M. A., B. D. pp. x., 455. $3.50.

To certain departments of literature, in recent years, Norwegian authors have contributed works that have received almost as much attention by the English reading public as at home. *Life after Death* introduces a Norwegian theological writer. It is the first of its class translated into English.

Bishop Dahle is Superintendent of the Missionary Work of the Norwegian Church, having been, since 1877, Bishop of the Norwegian church of Madagascar. He bears the title of the Order of St. Olaf for his distinguished services and investigations. The volume is a discussion of the Biblical doctrine of the last things, both as concerns the individual and the Church. It is a close study of the word; and where the word is silent, the distinction is marked between what is revealed and what is human speculation. In this respect Bishop Dahle's study is very candid and clear. Particularly is this true of the chapters, "The Kingdom of Death and the Intermediate State" and "The End." The author's teaching is bold and individual, but deeply Scriptural. He argues his points with scholarly patience and exhaustiveness. The book is a *study* of "last things." The style is popular and simple and the book will prove interesting reading in the hands of any reader.

H. C. A.

The Hope of Israel: A Review of the Argument from Prophecy. By F. H. Woods, B. D. pp. viii., 212. $1.40.

This volume is a collection of twelve lectures delivered by the author, on the Warburton foundation, in Lincolnshire Chapel in 1890-94. The lectures are on the fulfillment of prophecy and follow the lines established by modern exegesis, which find much more of fulfillment in the author's own times and less in the future. The study of Messianic prophecy is fine and suggests Riehm. The lectures are given a practical turn, and altogether are a positive contribution to the literature of the subject.

H. C. A.

The Spirit of Power as set forth in the Book of the Acts of the Apostles. By the Rev. Thomas Adamson. pp. 85. 50 cts.

This little work sets forth very cleverly according to the inspired text the state of the men who had the Spirit of Power in the Primitive Church, and it shows how that state was brought about. The author's method is exegetical rather than dogmatic. When he attempts the lat-

ter we cannot follow him. We do not believe that "the Jerusalem Church was baptized the second time," although we can accept the statement that "there was a new influx of power." It might be less misleading, however, to speak of a new manifestation of the power which was received once for all. E. J. W.

Foundation Truths of Scripture as to Sin and Salvation in Twelve Lessons. By John Laidlaw, D. D. pp. 131. 45 cts.

Not for a long while has a publication appeared containing in so brief a compass so large a measure of sound evangelical teaching. It is a clear, striking exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of Protestantism, and it adds very much to the reputation already won by "the Handbooks for Bible Classes" to which series it belongs.

The relation in which Prof. Laidlaw places regeneration to faith will have special interest to Lutherans. He makes regeneration "the absolutely initial grace, the very first step in personal salvation," and he holds that "the person who is just being changed is, at the time of the change, passive, if not even unconscious of it." Of faith he says: It is "the act not of a dead, but of a living soul, therefore the act of faith has been produced by the quickening grace of God's Holy Spirit." "The chain of initial or preparatory grace is complete when Faith crowns the series."

The value of the Sacraments is of course not emphasized as it is in the Lutheran Church, yet they are recognized as the symbol and seal of our union with Christ. Of the Holy Supper it is said: "No amount of abuse of this ordinance through externalism or superstition should make us forget its real place and power or fail in its gracious use or privilege." E. J. W.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND CO., BOSTON.

Visions and Service: Fourteen Discourses delivered in College Chapels. By William Lawrence, Bishop of Massachusetts. 12mo. pp. viii., 235. $1.25.

Bishop William Lawrence is the succesor of Phillips Brooks as Bishop of Massachusetts. For ten years he was dean of the Episcopal Theological School at Cambridge, and at the same time preacher to Harvard University. This volume is a collection of discourses, most of them delivered to the students in St. John's Memorial Chapel, some of them to the University students in Appleton Chapel. The discourses are clear and appealing—admirably adapted to the class of hearers to whom they were addressed. College and university students as a rule do not go to church for conventional reasons: they are indifferent to many of the methods of the pulpit; but they are won at once by ringing conviction, clear thought and genuine literary form. These elements characterize this volume of sermons, and we are not surprised to learn that Bishop Lawrence was ever popular with Harvard students.

The practical side of theology is always enforced, duty is made paramount, and "Visions and Service" blended in strong outline. It is a noble little volume. H. C. A.

Memories of Hawthorne. By Rose Hawthorne Lathrop.

All admirers of Hawthorne will be prepared for delightful entertainment in this volume, but it is by no means they alone who will find interest in it. The story of two such lives as those of Mr. and Mrs. Hawthorne, filled as they were with all that was ennobling and beautiful cannot fail to attract many readers for its own sake. Much of the story is told by the many letters of Mrs. Hawthorne which are given. These letters are full of interest and as her daughter says "profound in thought and loveliness." They begin with her girlhood and run on into her married life, which was the most ideal of any of which we have read. As might be supposed the friends of these cultured persons were among the most desirable of their period, and here the reader seems to be drawn into the very heart and life of the intellectual spirits of that time. And glimpses are obtained of them in their private life that are very pleasant. Mrs. Lathrop has added to these delightfully welcome reminiscences the charm of a graceful style, and as she writes of her father's literary successes and her mother's work in art, as she tells of their home life, than which none could have been more beautiful, and as she recounts their friendships with the great and good of their time, she completely fascinates her readers. It is in every detail a delightful book.

The Day of His Youth. By Alice Brown.

There is about this story a touch that is in every way artistic. It is the history of lives lived in a great degree apart from the world, with nature for a close and well-understood companion. The father of the hero, sickened with the sorrows of life and with the "wrongs which he could not right" betakes himself with his son to a lonely island and there becomes his sole companion and instructor, but a change in the situation occurs, and the further interesting developments the reader must find out for himself. One sentence particularly impressed us. It was in the advice which the father gave his son when he said: "And if you can, do something, too, for art—but after all, I shall be content if you keep your soul clean." We find many bright happy thoughts finely expressed and none more so than in the comparison of America with older nations. It is a unique story and one that will win many admirers. It is another book which will add much pleasure to the vacation days.

Upon the Tree-Tops. By Olive Thorne Miller.

Some one in writing of Helen Keller has said that in thinking of her she blushed to think how little she saw, how little she heard. It is

with a similar feeling that we read Mrs. Miller's new book. Her wonderful acquaintance with birds and nature in general is very powerful in convincing the general reader of his ignorance in that direction. It has been her pleasure intelligently to study the life and habits of her "little neighbors in feathers" and she has come very close to them, and has discovered for her own pleasure and the profit of her readers where certain birds are to be found, what their songs are, how they build their homes, on what they feed and, indeed, what their habits in general are. For some time Mrs. Miller had a bird-room in which to closely observe the creatures in which she has found so much of interest and the result of these observations which she here gives are very interesting, but we have been particularly pleased with the result of her tramps through woods and meadows and over hills and in deep valleys for she finds more than the birds in these walks: she has a keen appreciation for everything in nature, and whether she describes the sky or the country by-road, the various trees with which she is uncommonly familiar, or a neighboring cornfield, it is all filled with the charm of an intelligent lover of nature. We have found this book particularly pleasant and profitable and consider it especially adapted for the vacation tour, as it is likely to lead its readers into acquaintance with many songsters hitherto unknown and unnoticed.

Mere Literature. By Woodrow Wilson. pp. 247.

Eight essays, all but one of which have before appeared in leading magazines, are brought together in this volume. Their subjects are, Mere Literature; The Author Himself; On an Author's Choice of Company; A Literary Politician; The Interpreter of English Liberty; The Truth of the Matter; A Calendar of Great Americans; and The Course of American History. The style of this writer is excellent, his English pure and elevated, and he discovers and reveals new beauties in literature. If there is one thing that he succeeds in doing more than another it is in creating a taste for what is best in literature and a determination to find in the works of the best writers of the Ages their deepest, most hidden meanings. We cannot imagine any reader following the study of Mr. Wilson's book with any of the literary trash that is being so rapidly put upon the market. His own contempt for inferior literary work he imparts to his reader, and his ability to analyze a writer's merits he so forcibly impresses upon him, that he regards with envy the author's keen appreciation of literary work. If such books are read and studied more we may look to our near future for a different class of books.

THOMAS Y. CROWELL AND CO., BOSTON, MASS.

The Bible as Literature. By Prof. Richard G. Moulton, Ph. D., the Rev. John P. Peters, Ph. D., the Rev. A. B. Bruce, D. D. and others.

With an introduction by the Rev. Lyman Abbott, D. D. One vol. 12mo, pp. 375. Cloth $1.50.

CONTENTS.—Introduction; Chapter I., The Bible as Literature; Chapter II., Literary Aspects of Genesis; Chapter III., The Law of Moses; Chapter IV., The Age of the Judges; Chapter V., Ruth and Esther Chapter VI., The Book of Job as Literature; Chapter VII., The Poetry of the Psalms; Chapter VIII., The Wisdom Literature; Chapter IX., The Love-song of the Bible; Chapter X., A Study of Isaiah; Chapter XI., Jeremiah the Prophet; Chapter XII., Ezekiel and His Times; Chapter XIII., Amos at Bethel; Chapter XIV., The Book of Jonah; Chapter XV., The Parables; Chapter XVI., Luke as an Historian; Chapter XVII., The Fourth Gospel; Chapter XVIII., The Epistles of Paul as Literature; Chapter XIX., The Epistles to the Hebrews; Chapter XX., The Apocalypse of John; Chapter XXI., The Influence of Biblical upon Modern English Literature.

The literary study of the Bible has come to be the fashion among intellectual people. No line of reading has grown more popular. As a consequence the literature on the subject has multiplied. This volume takes its rank at once as probably the best hand-book on the subject accessible. There is an unusual array of talent: *e. g.*, Dr. Moulton on the general subject; Prof. Bruce on Moses; Prof. Genung on Job; Dr. Van Dyke on the Psalms; Prof. Beecher on The Wisdom Literature: Prof. Vincent on The Parables; Prof. Stevens on St. Paul, *et al.* It is to be remembered that literary students of the Bible are not pursuing doctrinal study. Biblical Theology is another matter. The literary student seeks to understand the literary form and purpose of a book and to give it its right setting. In recommending this volume as a popular hand-book we do not endorse all the views of individual writers. H. C. A.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Die rechte Unterscheidung von Gesetz und Evangelium. 39 Abendvorträge von Dr. C. F. W. Walther. Aus seinem Nachlass. 8vo. pp. 401.

When asked lately for translations of Dr. Walther's works, the writer of this responded, that the reading of Dr. Walther's works would repay every Lutheran minister for the mastery of the German language. In this conviction he feels very much strengthened by the present volume, which in a series of Lectures discusses the momentous distinction between the law and the gospel. A more instructive and a sounder treatise on this extremely practical subject is nowhere to be found. Dr. Walther absorbed, as probably no one had ever done before, and Luther brought out the teaching of Paul on this point as no teacher before him had done.

Luther's polemic against the antinomians of his day is clearly set forth, and his defense against their charge of inconsistency is exceedingly instructive.

Walther's analysis of Pietist theology and of its attempt to find in the Sermon on the Mount the successive stages of the order of salvation, shows the unsoundness of Pietistic interpretation of the Scriptures, notwithstanding its spiritual bloom while it adhered to orthodox teaching.

One of the most striking passages of this volume that has met our eye is the attack on the Separatists of Prussia, who in their recoil from "the Rationalism and Indifferentism of the State Church fell into Particularism and anti-Lutheran Hierarchism." Their claim that "the true visible Lutheran Church is the Church of the third article of the Creed, *the* Church in the highest and proper sense of the word, the ecclesia extra quam nulla salus," is declared to be a deplorable and momentous error, directly opposed to the dear word of God, and subversive of the cardinal doctrine of Christianity, the justification of a poor sinner before God only for Christ's sake through faith.

If our Lutheran Pastors generally could have the help of such a sterling volume, we are confident that their sermons would be vastly enriched with evangelical truth and that their hearers would profit proportionately in their edification. The very aim of these evening lectures to his students was, in the words of their author, "to speak the doctrines of Holy Scripture into their hearts." There was no cold or dead orthodoxy in Dr. Walther.

Now that we have this Second Series of the Lectures on *Gesetz und Evangelium* we very much regret that the first series, which made a small volume in boards, was not reserved to be bound along with the second series in one volume. Outwardly the two volumes have nothing in common, while in their contents the present volume is simply an expansion and completion of the other. E. J. W.

OPEN COURT PUBLISHING CO., CHICAGO.

Martin Luther. By Gustav Freytag. Translated by Henry E. O. Heinemann. pp. 130. $1.00.

We make two quotations from the early pages of this book which will show the spirit in which it was written—that the author, while he finds some things to censure, is after all a great admirer of Luther and is constrained, time and again, to express his admiration. On page 2 he says: "Some of those things, which in his stubborn fights Luther defended against both Reformed and Catholics, have been condemned by the freer intelligence of the present age. His doctrine, wrung from a passionate, high-strung, reverential soul in convulsive struggles, failed, in some not unimportant particulars, to hit the right point; at times he was harsh, unjust, even cruel towards his adversaries; but such things should no longer perplex us, for all the limitations of his nature and culture are overwhelmed by the wealth of bliss which flowed from his great heart into the life of mankind." And again, on page 4, this: "Many things about him appear strange and uncouth,

when viewed at a distance, but his picture has the remarkable quality of becoming bigger and more lovable the closer it is approached."

The book is not a biography in the sense of giving the events of his life in detail, but aims rather to let us know "how he grew and what he was." This it does in a charming way. It is only here and there at long intervals that a blemish is found, and the picture that is presented is, upon the whole, one that presents the great reformer in a most satisfactory way. We are sorry to see, however, (p. 84) that the old exaggeration is repeated of making Luther call the Epistle of James an "epistle of straw" instead of comparatively a right strawy epistle—"eine rechte stroherne Epistel." But the author has many companions in this offense and it will take many a correction yet before the expression is changed. The book is well printed and illustrated.

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE COMPANY, NEW YORK.

Annotations on the Epistles to Timothy, Titus and the Hebrews. By Edmund J. Wolf, D. D. On *Philemon.* By Edward T. Horn, D. D. pp. 519.

Annotations on the General Epistles of James, Peter, John, and Jude. By Revere F. Weidner, D. D., LL. D. pp. 380.

What Dr. Wolf says respecting the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles in answer to the objections as to their Pauline authorship is well put and altogether reasonable. The authorship of Hebrews he sensibly leaves an open question and wastes no words upon it. In his annotations on the various epistles he gives ample evidence of the masterful exegete. His discriminating use of the tenses and cases, and his appreciation of the full etymological force of Greek words and their synonyms make his comments unusually lucid. One of the places where this is quite well shown is in his annotations on Heb. 2 : 1–4, pages 264–268. As a model of clear and suggestive expository work we cite pages 53–58 on 1 Timothy 3 : 14–16. There are suggestions here for more than one sermon.

This belongs to a series that goes under the title of "Lutheran Commentary," but the marks of denominationalism are not much in evidence—certainly not obtrusively so. Indeed, if the title were not what it is, the denomination of the author could scarcely be detected from these comments.

The introduction and annotations on the epistle to Philemon by Dr. Horn are most excellent. They give a point and value to that epistle that will greatly enhance it in the estimation of every Bible student.

Dr. Weidner, in the General Epistles assigned to him, has given an example of clear and practical exposition of Scripture. The introductions to the several books are excellent, as also are the *excursus.* Of the latter two follow the Epistle of James—one on "The Helvidian

Theory" that the "brethren of our Lord" are the sons of Joseph and Mary, and the other on "Luther on the Epistle of James." Five follow the "First Epistle General of Peter," all of them of much interest. They are on "Peter as the Rock," "The Descent of the Soul of Christ into Hades at the Time of his death," "The Descent of Christ, the Risen God-Man, into Hades," "The Roman Catholic Doctrine of Purgatory," "The Doctrine of the Universal Restoration of the Wicked." To the General Epistle of Jude there is an *excursus* on "The Assumption of Moses." Dr. Weidner unhesitatingly favors the view that there were two descents into Hades. He says (p. 144): "Note distinctly that the passage in Acts 2 : 24–31 refers to the *Descent of the Soul of Christ* into Hades *before* his resurrection, and that this Descent is the last act in his state of humiliation, and must sharply be distinguished from his second Descent into Hades as the Risen God-Man, which is the first act of the state of *Exaltation*." This is the view he supports in Excursus II.

These two volumes are valuable additions to those of this series already issued by the Christian Literature Company.

EATON AND MAINS, NEW YORK.

History of the Christian Church. By John Fletcher Hurst. Vol. I. pp. 949. $5.00.

In issuing the "Library of Biblical and Theological Literature" the publishers are doing a most serviceable work for theological students. Those that have already appeared are, Harman's "Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures," Terry's "Biblical Hermeneutics," Bennett's "Christian Archaeology," Miley's "Systematic Theology" (in two volumes), Crooks and Hurst's "Theological Encyclopædia and Methodology," and the first volume of Hurst's "History of the Christian Church." They have been prepared by Methodist authors, printed by a Methodist publishing house, pledged to be in harmony, in doctrinal spirit, with the accepted standards of the Methodist Episcopal Church, but with the aim "to make the entire Library acceptable to Christians of all evangelical Churches." The denominational bias is distinctly manifest—fully enough to show that the authors have not been unmindful of the "pledge," and yet not to such an extreme that the "aim" to make their works acceptable to others than Methodists, is lost sight of. The whole set of books will make a desirable addition to any library.

This first volume of Bishop Hurst's Church History takes us to the German Reformation, thus covering about fifteen centuries. This period is divided into two parts—the history of the Ancient Church, A. D., 1--680 and the history of the Church of the Middle Ages, A. D., 768–1517. The Ancient Church is divided into (1) The Apostolic Age, A. D. 1–100; (2) The Patristic Age, 101–313; (3) The Controversial Age, 313–680. To give all this in one volume the treatment is necessarily incomplete. This, no doubt, was felt by the author even more

than it is by the reader. The second volume will begin with the time of Luther and bring the history to the present time. This will likely appear some time in 1898. Limited as the work will be to two volumes, though of good size, it will not supplant the standard histories by Neander, Gieseler, Kurtz or Mosheim, though it will have the merit of being less antiquated. Nor will it take the place of Schaff in the case of those who have ample time to give to the rich field of Church History; but to the theological student and the busy pastor this history will be most acceptable. Its fresh and pleasing style greatly enhances its attractions and gives much pleasure to the reader.

In a few places there is an intensity of portrayal that we regard as hardly supported by the facts of history, or at least as given with less guarded discrimination than should appear in a calm historical work. For example, take the picture given here of the Roman training of children, pp. 72–75. We doubt whether there can be found in any nation a more careful training of childhood in the duty of obedience to parents, in love of their country and respect for its laws, and in reverence for their gods (such as they were), than among the old Romans. This, indeed, is what made Rome so strong. The Roman "pedagogue" was not the child's school-teacher, as we are told here, and the fact that his teacher was a slave is very little in derogation of his school-training when we bear in mind that many of the Roman slaves were cultured Greeks. But where there is so much to commend in Dr. Hurst's history we would not magnify a fault found here and there on its interesting pages.

We take a special pleasure in calling attention to the valuable bibliography of this work. The author himself excels as a bibliographer, and he had most competent assistants in Dr. Faulkner and Rev. C. R. Gillett. The reader who has the bibliography of the first fourteen pages on general Church History and that which precedes each topic throughout the work, will find little else to be desired in this line. The discriminating estimates of the value of the various works are highly serviceable.

Champions of Christianity. By Silas Farmer. pp. 139. 60 cents.

This little book contains the testimony in favor of Christianity given by leading men of various nationalities and vocations. They are divided into five main classes and each one of these further divided into as many or more sub-classes. Thus we have statesmen, jurists, generals, philanthropists, physicians, lawyers, merchants, explorers, painters, architects, editors, philologists, poets, historians, astronomers, physicists, geologists, chemists, botanists, all reverently testifying to the truth and power of Christianity. It is a useful collation, and will prove helpful to faith as well as furnish examples to show that the brightest and best sons of earth have been champions of the religion of the lowly Nazarene rather than antagonists, as is so often confidently averred.

FLOOD AND VINCENT, MEADVILLE, PA.

Roman and Medieval Art. By W. H. Goodyear, M. A. pp. 250.

The interest in the old Roman world never wanes. Its surpassing success in organization, government and laws continues to win increasing admiration from the student of history. Its attainments in literature and art, however, were not so marked, and yet the student of language and art finds much to fascinate him and win him to investigation and study. Debtor as ancient Rome was to Greece and the Orient for her art, modern nations are equally indebted to Rome for theirs. Especially is this true when we use the word "art" as covering monuments and buildings as well as the paintings and sculpture that carry with them the suggestion of luxury rather than of what is practical.

The medieval period is often called the "Dark Ages" and few are disposed to spend much time on its history and art. And yet, when once we begin to lift the veil, we find enough to interest and even fascinate us. In a special degree is this true of the art of the latter part of the Middle Ages, and preëminently in Gothic architecture. The cathedrals in this style have long been the admiration of the world.

This book does a good service in telling us about "Roman and Medieval Art." The illustrations, of which there are one hundred and fifty-nine, are excellent and add a charm to the plain and otherwise unadorned text. The good quality of the paper and printing helps to make attractive a very valuable and pleasing book.

Notices of *The Prophecies of Jesus Christ* by Schwartzkopff, of Vol. II., of the *Hebrew People*, by Kent, and of the "New Greek Concordance" are unavoidably delayed. All are publications from the House of Charles Scribner's Sons.

PERIODICALS.

The Atlantic Monthly for July contains a list of articles that will prove very tempting to all lovers of choice literature. It is only to these that the *Atlantic* caters and for them it monthly spreads such a feast as gives the highest pleasure, the surest profit. In this number are discussed in the best possible manner, The Making of the Nation; John Sterling and a Correspondence Between Sterling and Emerson; The Decline of Legislatures; The Future of Rural New England; Burke: A Centenary Perspective; Jowett and the University Ideal; The Stony Pathway to the Woods by that delightful writer, Olive Thorne Miller; and Strauss the Author of the Life of Jesus. The readers of the QUARTERLY will find the July number filled with valuable matter.

The Century for July comes full of excellent articles just when the general reader has most time for it. Among the papers which will attract the most attention are the following: Old English Masters, Cole's New Series; Play in London; Campaigning with Grant; After Big Game in Africa and India: Hunting the Jaguar in Venezuela; Sports in the Seventeenth

Century; The Churches of Poitiers and Caen; Up the Matterhorn in a Boat; An American Citizen; and Are the Bosses Stronger than the People? The fiction of this number, poetry, Topics of the Time, Open Letters, and in Lighter Vein, are all up to the usual high grade of this excellent magazine.

St. Nicholas for July seems to have been gotten up with the idea of giving as much profit and pleasure as possible to its readers. All through the vacation days they will enjoy it. How Grandmother Met the Marquis de Lafayette; The Last of the Drums; The Chesapeake Mill; Hunting for Shells; A *fac-simile* Letter of George Washington's; The Little Drummer of the Woods; Girlhood Days of England's Queen; Honors to the Flag in Camp and Armory; and Brownies of the Insect World will all instruct the *St. Nicholas* readers, while a generous number of stories, poems, letters, puzzles and oh, so many lovely pictures will make the hours and days of July infinitely more delightful than they can be to those unfortunate young people who do not have the opportunity of read-this helpful magazine.

The July number of *Table Talk* must prove itself a welcome visitor in every household where it finds its way. It contains a number of timely articles but particularly acceptable are all the recipes for dainty and tempting Summer dishes. Many frozen dainties and hints for the various uses of the fruits of the season are given, and many valuable suggestions concerning the various interests of the home. Wherever *Table Talk* is really used there must be improved cooking, daintier and more acceptable service and, indeed, up-to-date housekeeping.

„ BETTER THAN EVER"

The 1897 BEN-HUR BICYCLES embody more new and genuine improvements in construction than any other bicycles now before the public. Never before have such excellent values been offered for the money. Our new line, consisting of eight superb models at $60, $75 and $125 for single machines, and $150 for tandems, with the various options offered, is such that the most exacting purchaser can be entirely suited.

CENTRAL CYCLE MFG. CO.,

72 GARDEN STREET. **INDIANAPOLIS, IND.**

OUR FINE POSTER CATALOGUE MAILED FOR TWO 2-CENT STAMPS.

THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF

THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

OCTOBER, 1897.

ARTICLE I.

IMMORTALITY IN THE LIGHT OF SCRIPTURE AND NATURE.

By W. F. Eyster, D. D.

Nowhere in the wide range of theological literature, can we find a more concise, clear and satisfactory exposition of the scriptural doctrine of immortality, than that which is presented in the following digest of the teachings of some of the great Lutheran theologians of the period immediately following the Reformation. "In death the natural life of man ceases, it is true, as this was conditioned by the peculiar connection between body and soul, but the soul does not succumb as the body, but lives on with all the attributes and powers that belong to its nature. * * For the immortality of the soul reason has from time immemorial set up an array of proofs but we become incontrovertibly certain of it through the positive declarations of the Holy Scriptures. * * From them we learn, also, this much concerning the condition of the soul after death, that its lot immediately after death is a happy or unhappy one, just as its possessor in this life embraced salvation through Christ or not. * * The doctrine of an intermediate condition of the soul, in which it is neither happy nor unhappy, is therefore erroneous; also, the Roman Catholic view, according to which not two, but five different places

are to be assumed, where we are to suppose the souls of the departed to be. * * The separation of body and soul which is occasioned by death, is not of permanent continuance, but the time will come, as we are positively assured in the word of God, in which God will re-awaken the body and reunite it with the soul that belonged to it before death. * * This will be in substance the same body with which the soul was united in this life, but endowed with new attributes, adapted to the nature of the circumstances then existing. * * But just as the condition of souls after death is different according as they were godless or pious in this life, so will also the bodies of the resurrected receive different attributes according as a happy or a miserable life is their portion."

It is interesting and important to observe, first of all, in this exposition of the doctrine of man's immortality by Lutheran theology, the emphasis which is laid on one of the grand principles of the Reformation, the supreme authority in matters of religious faith of the word of God. The incontrovertible evidence of the immortality of the soul, its condition immediately after death, the future reunion of soul and body, the nature and attributes of the resurrected body are sought and found in the Sacred Scriptures. The revelation of all the great doctrines which concern the destiny and salvation of man has been progressive. It is not, therefore, a matter of surprise that the doctrine of the future state is much less clearly unfolded in the Old Testament than the New. In the former there are passages neither few nor doubtful which imply man's immortality, hopes expressed by righteous men for themselves of a life with God hereafter, and intimations in the prophets of the future state. But what was partially revealed under the old economy is far more clearly revealed under the new. Objects before dimly discerned in the gloom now stand clearly unveiled so that immortality as shown by Christ has become in one sense a new doctrine. By his teaching and resurrection our Saviour made it not a vague hope but a glad certainty. He enlarged our knowledge of the nature of the future life, and so revealed its fulness as to make this doctrine give new motive to a holy and happy life on earth. To

those who learn to trust him, who believe that he came forth from God with a message of truth and reality for man, his word is enough for faith, for conviction, for hope. He brings "life and immortality to light through the Gospel." And yet so important, so critical is the question for each of us, that he adds something more to his bare word,—his own resurrection! The assurance that Jesus Christ, who lived on earth, who died on the cross, and was committed a mutilated, dead body to the tomb, rose uninjured and then exchanged an earthly for a heavenly life, puts to flight the sad forebodings which rise like spectres from the grave, and helps us to conceive of the believer's appointed triumph over death. "According to his abundant mercy God hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled and that fadeth not away reserved in heaven."

CONTENTS OF THE DOCTRINE.

The scriptural doctrine of immortality as expounded by Lutheran theology includes the *continued conscious existence of the soul* when the natural life of man ceases. "The soul lives on with all the attributes and powers that belong to its nature." This view recognizes and includes the scriptural anthropology, that man is compounded of two distinct substances, body and soul, that the body as the penalty of sin is mortal and corruptible until the resurrection, that the soul by divine appointment and creation is indestructible and immortal, and although designed for a bodily organism, is capable of independent life and action.

This scriptural view stands opposed to the materialistic notion that the soul is merely a function of the body and perishes with it. For if there be no substance but matter and no force but such as is a mere phenomenon of matter, and if the form in which physical force manifests as mind or mental action depends on the highly organized matter of the brain, then when the brain is disorganized the mind ceases to exist. But if, as the Bible plainly teaches, the soul and body are two distinct substances, then the dissolution of the latter does not necessarily

involve the end of conscious existence of the soul or of its independent action.

There are some Christian believers, who reject the theory of the identity of mind and matter, who yet hold that mind can not act or manifest itself without a material organ. Thus, for example, Isaac Taylor in his well known "Physical Theory of Another Life," says: "As extension is a property of matter, we can not imagine that the soul without a body is or can be in any place, or that it has any kind of relationship to the visible and extended universe. To its union with body mind is indebted for its sensations and perceptions, for its power over matter. The soul after death, therefore, must either cease its activity, at least in reference to all out of itself, or be furnished *at once* with a new body." He assumes this supposition to be a fact, and then says: "Have the dead ceased to exist? No; for there is a spiritual body and another vehicle of human nature, as well as a natural body, and, therefore, the dissolution of the animal structure leaves the life untouched." The view just stated is generally held by the so-called liberal and Unitarian Christians of the present day, who discard the orthodox view of a future resurrection, and hold to an *anastasis* immediately after death, which consists in the entrance of the soul out of the mortal body into a spiritual organism. * * It must be admitted that our consciousness and experience show that in this life there is an intimate and vital union between the mind and body, and that they act and react on each other. Their mutual relation is admitted to be mysterious. We have no sufficient reason to deny that the soul can and does exist and act after death; that the body may be disorganized, reduced to dust, and still the soul retain its conscious life and activity although disembodied. This appears to be the clearly revealed doctrine of the Bible. It speaks of angels as spirits incorporeal and yet ascribes to them place and power to produce effects in the spiritual and material worlds. Why, then, deny to disembodied human spirits place or power or relations to the outward universe? When Paul desired to be *absent from the body* and present with the Lord, he knew that his conscious personal existence was to be contin-

ued after the dissolution of his body. * * We find no sufficient support in the Sacred Scriptures for the supposition of a spiritual body evolved from the mortal body immediately after death. The Bible does not appear ever to speak of man's having any other body than his present earthly tabernacle, the body now inhabited by the soul, to be in the last day reanimated. * * The great statesman, Charles Fox, once asked an English nobleman, "My lord, what do you think of the state of the soul after death?" When his friend hesitated to make reply, Mr. Fox continued—"That the soul is immortal, I am convinced. The existence of the Deity is a proof that spirit exists; why not therefore the soul of man? And if such an essence as the soul exists, by its nature it must exist forever: it must be immortal. How it acts, as separated from the body, is beyond my capacity of judgment. I have a mortal disease and am fast sinking into the grave and this mystery I shall soon know."

The doctrine of the soul's conscious existence after death stands opposed to the false system of *pantheism.* Pantheism not only denies the personal existence of God, affirming that the universe is God and God is the universe, but it also denies the individual subsistence of man. He is but a moment in the life of God; a wave on the surface of the sea; a leaf which falls and is renewed year after year. When the body, which makes the distinction of persons among men, perishes, personality ceases with it. There is no conscious existence, therefore, after death. Man's individual being, his personality, ceases with death. The absorption of his soul into nature called God, of the finite into the infinite, is the highest destiny that pantheism can promise for man. * * It is sufficient to say of this false theory that it is the worst form of atheism, that it contradicts the plain teachings of the Sacred Scriptures as well as the laws of belief impressed on our nature; that it subverts the very foundation of religion and morality.

A *conditional* continuous existence after death over against an *absolute* or *natural immortality* of the soul has been taught by some Protestant Christians. Their central proposition is that without and outside of Jesus Christ there can be no immortality

for any human soul: that it is not a quality or part of the nature of a sinful soul. Accordingly they teach that only those who have faith in the Giver of Life can receive it. All who are outside of him, by virtue of the poison and extinguishing power of sin, must eventually end in annihilation. The doctrine of immortality is *conditioned* by faith and a holy life. This view is opposed to the general belief of the Christian Church, and, we think, finds no support in any just interpretation of Holy Scripture. Evidently it teaches that no soul can ever die in the sense of becoming extinct. No piety is necessary in order that any soul may live on forever, and no impiety can lead to its annihilation. The soul is deathless independently of both. God can not be provoked to extinguish the immortality of the most provoking spirit in the universe. The life of the body may be periled and cut short in judgment, but sin can never rouse judgment against the vitality of the soul, for devouring fire can not consume it, nor the worm that dieth not waste it. The endless being of every soul is a matter unalterably fixed by creation. Neither providence nor judgment will ever disturb that appointment. Gerhard has well said: "God could, if he wished, reduce the soul to nothing and altogether extinguish it: but because he wished and decreed it to be immortal, it continues through and because of the will of the immortal Creator. The soul is not immortal in the same manner as God, that is, essentially and independently, for in that sense God alone is said to have immortality, (1 Tim. 6 : 15) but through the grace of creation, because it was so fashioned by God as not to have in itself an inner principle of corruption, but to be incorporeal, invisible and immortal."

Lutheran theology teaches, further, that we learn from the Holy Scriptures *this much concerning the condition of the soul after death that its lot immediately after death is a happy or unhappy one*, just as its possessor embraced salvation through Christ or not."

"The souls of men separated from the body," says Quenstedt, "do not sleep, neither are they insensible until the time of the resurrection." The disembodied spirit does not enter a dream-

land, a condition of torpor and utter oblivion till awakened by the trump of God along with the risen body. "We believe," says Hutter, "that the souls of the pious attain essential blessedness immediately after they have been separated from the body," (Phil. 1 : 23; Luke 23 : 43; John 5 : 24; Rev. 7 : 4, 15), "but that the souls of the wicked undergo their own undoing," (1 Pet. 3 : 19). In the parable of the rich man and Lazarus it was an essential part of the truth our Lord intended to convey, when the angels are represented as carrying the spirit of the beggar into Abraham's bosom, that conscious happiness followed immediately after death. Christ's words to the dying, penitent and believing thief, "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise," are sufficient to set at rest this comforting assurance that the gate of death and the gate of glory are one to the believer. No wonder St. Paul, with such a blessed certainty before him, could say: "We are confident I say and willing rather to be absent from the body and present with the Lord." In the graveyard that surrounds one of the old churches of the city of Philadelphia, an upright marble slab marks the grave of a pastor's deceased wife. The bereft husband in token of his hope and comfort caused this simple inscription to be engraved on the tombstone: "Absent from the body,—Present with the Lord!"

Lutheran theology discards the doctrine that there is some intermediate state of purification for the soul, preparatory to being introduced into the presence of the Lord. The doctrine of purgatory was rejected by the Lutheran Church not only because it had no foundation in scripture, but especially as conflicting with the doctrine of justification by faith alone. Every thing that is ascribed to the satisfactions either of purgatory or the intercession of the saints, detracts from the merit of Christ which alone cleanses us from sins.

The revealed doctrine of immortality as interpreted by Lutheran theology embraces as an essential element the future re-animation of the body, its reunion with the soul that belonged to it before death, and its investiture with "new attributes adapted to the nature of the circumstances then existing."

This is peculiarly a doctrine of revelation. The outer world

gives us a few hints as to the possibility of a truth beyond the province of reason. The germ expanding into a perfected blossom,—the little grain of wheat buried in its tiny grave of inert clod, bursting forth into green and fruitful stalk,—the torpid caterpillar cradled in a dark cell, becoming the birth place of beauteous insect, mounting to heaven on wings of purple and gold,—these are some familiar analogies of the re-animation of the human dead, and yet these are mere hints, as are our instinctive longings for the restoration of the earthly tabernacle. The doctrine implies a miracle the most stupendous. All mere rational belief is staggered by the first thought of what is meant by raising and reconstructing the mortal part of man. The resurrection of the body is an essentially Christian doctrine as well as an essential part of Christianity. In the Creed which we have repeated from infancy, we have been taught to say confidently—"I believe in the resurrection of the body." And there is not a doctrine of the Gospel that is more strongly, clearly and fully declared. "This corruptible shall put on incorruption and this mortal shall put on immortality." "The dead shall be raised incorruptible." Remembering that the soul is not all of man; remembering that it needs body and soul in union to constitute the perfect human being; remembering that the body is redeemed with Christ's blood as well as the soul;—the great apostle hesitates not to say, that only when this corruptible has put on incorruption and this mortal immortality, *then* shall be brought to pass the saying that is written,—"Death is swallowed up in victory!" Though it be true that "the souls of believers are at death made perfect in holiness and do immediately pass into glory," their full and perfect glorification only takes place at the reunion of body and soul.

According to the characteristics imparted to those raised from the dead, as the saved or lost, their resurrection is termed—"The resurrection of life," or "The resurrection to judgment." In his song of praise and triumph over death and the grave in the fifteenth chapter of first Corinthians, St. Paul describes the qualities which shall be peculiar to the pious and believing alone, and to sum up all tells us that their resurrected bodies shall be

made in conformity with the glorified body of Christ. But though the transformation must necessarily be great, personal identity will remain undestroyed. No change but this that the shifting tent will be transmuted into "a building of God," reared of permanent and imperishable materials, a bodily structure that shall know no decrepitude, smiles that shall never die, new powers conferred which earth may have longed for but never possessed,—all emulous of the divine glory, and instinct with burning and untiring zeal in the divine service. Glorious body, indeed, without sin, without pain, without weakness or weariness.

Our latest thoughts of the Scriptural doctrine of immortality reach beyond the resurrection and the general judgment, to that "forever" which awaits the re-embodied believer. St. Paul describing these last events of man's earthly history, ends with the words,—"And so shall we *ever* be with the Lord."—"What a volume" says an eloquent writer is contained in these words. To think that after millions on millions of years and ages shall have rolled by, still I shall be on the threshold of immortal being, on the confines and outskirts of limitless life. My lifetime commensurate with that of God himself. His throne the centre of my bliss, *eternity* the circumference." The immortality thus suggested is an idea so sublime, so vast that no thought can measure it. It is an ocean without a shore. The lowliest child of Adam's race, if immortal, is an august being. An immortal man! An undying consciousness! A moral rational, embodied being, thinking, acting, feeling, rejoicing or suffering forever, having some destiny, some condition of existence lasting as eternity.

> "How complicate, how wonderful is man?
> An heir of glory, frail child of dust!
> Helpless immortal! Insect infinite!"

NATURAL AND MORAL GROUNDS FOR BELIEF IN IMMORTALITY.

It has pleased God in his wisdom and love to reveal great religious truths to man through various channels of communica-

tion, through the works of his creative power, through visible providence in the order and government of the world, through the intuitive perceptions and laws of primary belief he has impressed on man's mortal and moral constitution, and above all and more clearly than in all, through the express communications he has made by holy men of old, and especially by his Son, Jesus Christ, as contained in Holy Scripture. These oracles of God, in whatever form they are uttered, must, when rightly understood and interpreted, be found in perfect harmony. The proof of immortality which is incontrovertible and which is suited to all understandings is found in the Gospel, sealed by the blood and confirmed by the resurrection of Christ. But this is made impressive by a demonstration of its harmony with the teachings of nature. Nature and revelation in the Gospel speak with one voice on the great theme of man's future being. The voice in both is that of God. Reason enlightened by revelation accords with and adopts its doctrine of immortality. It is a doctrine written alike in the sacred Scriptures, in the intuitions of the soul and in the moral order of the universe. On a doctrine of such vast moment and universal reach, it is grateful to the human mind to find a general correspondency between the revelation of God in his word and his teaching through the inward suggestions of our own nature as well as through outward signs.

The question then stands, "What are the natural and moral grounds of our hope and belief of a future, endless life?"

A class of arguments for the immortality of the soul is known as the *metaphysical proof*, and consists in inferences from the supposed substance of the soul and its natural phenomena. It is common to urge from these sources a natural and necessary immortality. The usual course of reasoning has been, "The soul is indivisible, it can not therefore be dissolved." What we call death is a dissolution; the soul, therefore, cannot die. It is *necessarily* immortal. "The soul is immaterial and, therefore, can not be annihilated by the dissolution of a material body. The soul is of the nature of God—something divine and, therefore, cannot perish." It was on grounds of this kind that all the

ancient philosophers except Socrates made issue. He alone, here as everywhere else standing out prominently from the ancient world, based his argument on moral not on physical grounds. The different schools asserted or denied the immortality of the soul according to their assumed theories of the substance or physical nature of the soul. The Epicurean assumed it to be a congeries of atoms, and therefore dissoluble and mortal. The Pythagorean that it was a monad, a numeric unity, and, therefore, incapable of dissolution and death.

It is evident that reasoning of this kind is unsatisfactory and inconclusive. The substance of the soul does not decide its immortality. Materiality does not preclude, nor immateriality ensure it. The question still rests with God. He alone has *necessary* immortality, and all created beings are or are not immortal as he wills.

Another class of arguments is drawn from a generally admitted doctrine of modern science, the indestructibility of matter and force, and the conclusion it furnishes as to a universal law, as applicable to the spiritual as to the material. * * Science knows nothing of the destruction or even of the deterioration of matter. So far as may be known no atom of matter is ever destroyed or lost. In the burial of ages, the mouldering dust of innumerable dead, in the ravages of oceans, the flow of rivers, the crumbling of mountains, there is nothing lost.

> "Nothing is lost; the drop of dew
> That trembles on the leaf or flower
> Is but exhaled to fall anew
> In summer thunder shower.
> The little drift of common dust
> By the March winds disturbed and tost
> Though scattered by the fitful gust
> Is changed but never lost."

And so force, energy, motion, changed in one form, perpetually re-appears in another.

As mind is superior to matter and possesses energy as an inherent attribute, it is inferred that it must come surely under this law of indestructibility and can never perish. In the destruction of a thinking, moral being there would be an absolute

destruction. It would not be like the setting of the sun, which is but the transfer of light to new regions, but rather a quenching of the light. It would be a ruin such as nature nowhere else exhibits, a ruin of what is infinitely more precious than the material universe, and is not to be inferred from any of the changes of the outward world.

It has been truly said "that from time immemorial reason has set up her array of proofs for the immortality of the soul." It was a tenet taught by all the ancient systems of religion, Egyptian, Assyrian, Persian, Hindoo, Grecian and Roman. Whether this is to be regarded as a relic of an early divine revelation handed down by tradition from generation to generation, or whether we are to regard it as the triumph of unassisted reason,—in either case it seems to say to us,—the scripture must indeed be true which tells us that God created man in his own image; the image of his intelligence, the likeness of his reason and of his reflection. This historic evidence of the wide prevalence of the doctrine among all nations shows how deeply seated is the hope in human hearts.

After a due consideration of the arguments that have just been detailed, whatever probable intimations they furnish of the doctrine of immortality, they can give us only hints and probabilities. They leave the longing soul far short of gladdening assurance. The argument which alone gives us certainty must be one that *finds its grounds of belief in God.* That "in him we live, move, and have being," will be as true millions of ages hence, as at this moment. The whole question is, What is God's will? Can we extract an answer clear and sure from his breast, in whom dwells the mighty secret, by the key of Nature? This is the problem now to be solved.

We have certain primary beliefs and feelings which we are compelled to act on, and the contradiction of which makes our whole nature and being a falsehood, and loses us the present as well as the future life. The truthfulness of our intellectual and moral intuitions is a principle universally and necessarily admitted in all reasoning.

What, then, is the testimony which the consciousness of the

soul compels it to make from itself to its God. His will as to our future being, how shall we learn that? God speaks by the constitution of the nature he has given us, by the laws of intellectual and moral belief he has ordained. What he thus utters could not have his veracity pledged more certainly if it were written by lightnings, or pealed forth in the thunders of heaven. It is in this way he has promised a future life to the soul of man through the revelation of himself to the human consciousness. "As God, through the laws of belief he has established within me, assures me through my own existence of his being and power, and by the same constitution of my nature, tells me he is reasonable, benevolent, just and true, all these attributes are a declaration of his will that the soul shall be immortal." The denial of the soul's immortality must involve the denial of the attributes of reasonableness, and justice, and benevolence of the Deity, and so contradict the primary laws of belief and the moral intuitions of the human soul. It must, therefore, be absurd and false.

It is a law of our mental and moral natures to expect and require order and congruity in the universe,—*a correspondence of ends to means*,—and so to demand an adequate end for the human soul. There can not be a reasonable universe of which man is a part, which does not provide for the perfect development of all his capacities. That development involves his personal immortality. The capacities of the soul look up into the mighty future for their full development. If death be the commencement of an eternal sleep, for what end was man made thus gifted and godlike? Why these great powers for nothing? This advance on thought and character for no end beyond? Man's end surely is not reached in this life. Every human life is like an unfinished tale in a magazine with "to be continued" written at its close, to show that it is not ended. The human soul contains within itself prophecies of its immortality. The wings of a bird before it leaves its shell are a prediction of a higher life. Vast forces are slumbering in our bosom, unseen, unfelt, till the springs of action are touched and their concealed glories come forth as the sublime regalia of man's intellectual

and moral nature. Is it the fitting end of a wondrous piece of mechanism to be dashed in pieces, just as, with much expense and pains, it has been constructed? But such a mechanism we may consider the soul of man at death. Life is to it but the period of discipline and accumulation of power for future action and enjoyment. At death it still demands an *end.* And is there no end beyond this life? Are powers accumulated only to be destroyed? Virtues disciplined for annihilation? Capacities for active service and enjoyment expanded for eternal blasting? Surely if the soul is mortal almighty unreason sits on the throne of the universe! But such a conclusion the soul feels, yes, *knows* to be absurd. From the harmonies of the universe, the chain of correspondencies binding all being; from the depths of its own nature it cries out an indignant,—"It can not be!"

This conviction of a future endless life becomes still stronger as we study the manifest *incompleteness of present good in the light of* God our Creator: *benevolence.* Here and now happiness is at best but partial and often deeply marred. Our earthly lives bring with them many blessings and open many sources of enjoyment. And yet none are without experiences of sorrow and disappointment. Why do we find that in this life the soul can never find a perfect or satisfying good? Why do we see virtue often walking in this world under a cloud—her path one of pain and darkness and tears? Is it urged that this is the discipline of a loving Father? Discipline for what? To what? Annihilation? or, to a life where "these light afflictions, which are for a moment, shall work out a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory?" A benevolent God utters in our ears but one answer. In assuring us that he delights in the happiness of his creatures, he has assured us of another life, where true believers shall find a bliss without alloy and without end. The longing desire of every soul for happiness complete and perpetual asks for a future life, or the present life would be a mockery and a tragic sport.

That God wills the soul's immortality because he is love our moral sense infers from the incompleteness of man's present development with reference to God, even in his best moral state

in this life. * * Man is plainly made as if there were a God who made him, and made him for that God. The belief in God is a necessity of human thought. There is an element in the soul of man, or rather a combination of elements, religious capacities and wants that ever tend upward. Man is a creature, who having a Creator, finds his true sphere and destiny, when he finds and worships God.

And yet how difficult here and now is this problem of God either with or without revelation. How mysteriously distant the Being who is yet so near! The heavens move in silence and we see their motion, but we see not the God that moves them. If we pray, he responds not in any audible voice. Communion with him, though ever so real, must cross a great gulf. And is this to be our permanent state? Shall we never rise above the visions of time? Is the experience of the holiest saint the best that is possible to man? Religion, as a glowing, living fact in the soul, is even now and here a superlative good as compared with every other good of earth, and yet it seems but a drop taken from a boundless sea. The God who now invites our thought and love and worship, who admits us to a partial worship; does he purpose no more? As a privilege, a foretaste, a discipline, a preparation, religion in the soul of man is a grand fact, but it wants a future life to consummate it. Immortality is needed to expound and perfect it. God's love to man gives assurance that there will be hereafter an immortal life where there shall be a full unfolding and development of the new, spiritual, holy nature begotten in this life by the Spirit of God.

Our moral sense compels us to believe that God is just and that the order of a just Providence is to make it well with the righteous and ill with the wicked, distributing rewards and punishments for actions done according to their moral quality. This law we see is not fully executed in time, vice is often in triumph and virtue in distress; the good man laden with heavy woes and the bad man sitting at his ease; the Christian martyr burning at the stake and the profligate sinner in luxurious indulgence, defying God,—this plainly is not a perfect ex-

emplification of moral Providence. If there be a God who made the world, and if he be a moral Being, then something more remains: some sequel in the future follows the close of the present life: some righting of what now seems partial and incomplete is and must be the business of eternity. The voice of God within us assures us that there is another life where retribution shall overtake impenitent guilt, and happiness and honor crown suffering virtue.

The irrepressible feelings and intuitive inferences which arise in our minds from a view of the above facts compel us to believe in the immortality of the soul. And this belief is inseparably associated with our belief that God is *true.* He has so made us that we necessarily infer an hereafter because he is reasonable, good and just. His truth forbids the blasphemous supposition that, by the laws of belief he has impressed on our minds, we should believe a lie. Moral intuition no more admits of question than intellectual. The law that like causes produce like effects holds as well in regard to moral as to physical causes. Feeling and beliefs flowing from our original constitution are the voice of our Creator and must be regarded as, like their source, infallibly true.

The grounds on which all valid arguments from nature on this subject must rest show the necessity of a special Revelation for the complete establishment of the doctrine of man's immortality. The argument from nature being founded on a true idea of God in a world where that idea has been clouded and darkened a new Revelation of him becomes an absolute need. One was needed to come from heaven to be both the revealer of God, and the bringer of "Life and Immortality to light." One mightier than death, in whom are hid all treasures of wisdom and grace, has come to show us the Father, to be the living witness of a life to come. Of a future existence "God hath now given assurance to all men in that he raised Jesus Christ from the dead." Human nature looks up to her Redeemer and receives from him the boon of eternal life, the purchase and the triumph of his mighty agony and death!

ARTICLE II.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

[THE HOLMAN LECTURE ON THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION, DELIVERED IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, GETTYSBURG, PA., JUNE 2, 1897.]

BY REV. FRANK P. MANHART, A. M.

Article X of our Confession reads as follows: De Coena Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint, et distribuantur vescentibus in Coena Domini; et improbant secus docentes.

Melanchthon's edition of 1540 reads: De Coena Domini docent, quod cum pane et vino vere exhibeantur corpus et sanguis Christi vescentibus in Coena Domini.

The German text is: Vom Abendmahl des Herrn wird also gelehret, dass wahrer Leib und Blut Christi wahrhaftiglich unter Gestalt des Brots and Weins im Abendmahl gegenwärtig sei, und da ausgetheilt und genommen wird. Denhalben wird auch die Gegenlehr verworfen.

The Apology says: Confitemur, nos sentire, quod in Coena Domini vere et substantialiter adsint corpus et sanguis Christi et vere exhibeantur cum illis rebus, quae videntur, pane et vino, his, qui sacramentum accipiunt.

The English translation of Article X with the modifying terms from the German reads: Of the Supper of the Lord they teach that the (true) body and blood of Christ are truly present (under the form of bread and wine) and are (there) communicated to those that eat in the Lord's Supper (and received). And they disapprove of those that teach otherwise (wherefore also the opposite doctrine is rejected).

The irenic purpose in view in the preparation of the Augsburg Confession did not call for an extended statement of each doctrine. The Tenth Article states the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper with sufficient fullness to prove that the Lu-

theran Churches held to a doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist harmonious with the Scriptures, the Early Church, and even with the Roman Church so far as that could be judged by the writings of the Fathers. (Epilogue to the Doctrinal Articles).

A lectureship, like that so generously founded by that stalwart Lutheran theologian, Rev. Dr. Holman, naturally calls for historic studies and amplified restatements of the teachings of the doctrines of the Augustana.

In treating the article De Coena Domini, it seems specially fitting to approach it, by a survey of the salient lines along which Luther and Melanchthon apprehended and developed the doctrine rather than by a study of the doctrine as stated afterward in the dogmatics of orthodox Lutheran theologians.*

The Augsburg Confession is the joint work of both Luther and Melanchthon. While it is true, on the one hand, that Luther was the spiritual father of Melanchthon, and that, as early as 1518, Luther had a firm grasp of the fundamental ideas of his complete theological system: yet it is also true, that from 1518 to 1530, Luther and Melanchthon were constant companions, and their theological development went forward with a common pace.

Melanchthon had the genius of the investigator, the scholar, and the teacher. In acquirements, in disposition, in congenial activity, he was "at home" in a university; and, beyond any other, was himself the living embodiment of an ideal university.

The first twelve years of their friendship were remarkable,

*In some parts of the lecture it would be a satisfaction to refer at times more directly to the original sources of information. As free use was made of expressions and quotations collected at various times it has not been practical to do this. This is specially regretted in the case of Occam. Some of his works only are in print, (one edition at Strasburg, 1496). While some of his philosophical works were used directly, it is believed that there is no copy of his tractate *De Sacramento* in America. The extracts are doubtless reliable though they come directly from collected notes. In the section referring to the Zwinglian party free use was made of advance sheets of Vol. II, of Köstlin's Luther's Theology as translated by Rev. C. E. Hay, D. D. The New Market translation of the Grosses Bekenntniss vom Abendmahl of 1528 was also used.

equally for the amount and the character of those labors, which changed the face of civilization.

So far as Luther is concerned, there was, after 1530, no material increase of ideas or gain in the power of expressing them.*

Up to that date, and probably also ever afterward, Luther and Melanchthon were an absolute unity in the faith, confessed in Article X of the Augsburg Confession.†

Luther brought to his task the highest and most forceful genius ever given to a man; so that, under God, he could touch life with epoch-making power at a score of points, and then become the personal source of all subsequent progressive civilization and history.‡

*Well known extreme statements of Luther have been purposely omitted. A man of as ardent a temperament as Luther's and so pressed with labors, difficulties and enemies, and engaged so often in bitter controversies, inevitably makes some statements that pass beyond the general trend of his thought; and which, in the system resultant from his teaching are therefore wisely and even necessarily ignored. Besides, with its irenic purpose the Augustana presented nothing in extreme form. Only thus could it have become the œcumenical symbol of œcumenical Lutheranism, that it undoubtedly is. Furthermore Melanchthon, and not Luther, wrote the Confession, and the Confession is extreme in nothing historical and Scriptural.

†In the absence of testimony, save from non-Lutherans or those who in their zeal for Lutheranism lacked the breadth and fairness of Luther, we must take Melanchthon at his word when he says that he never departed from the faith of Luther. cf. Jacobs on Melanchthon in *Lutheran* of Feb. 19, 1897.

In the Saxon Confession (1551) which Melanchthon called a "Repetition and Exposition of the Augsburg Confession," he is clear and firm in maintaining the Lutheran view of the Eucharist.

‡Carlyle's rugged and forceful statements of the philosophy of modern history appears in his Heroes and Hero Worship. "The Diet of Worms, Luther's appearance there on the 17th of April 1521, may be considered as the greatest scene in Modern European History; the point, indeed, from which the whole subsequent history of civilization takes its rise.

* * * * * * * * * * *

It is, as we say, the greatest moment in the Modern History of Men. English Puritanism, England and its Parliaments, Americas and vast work these two centuries; French Revolution, Europe and its work everywhere at present: the germ of it all lay there: had Luther in that moment done other, it had all been otherwise!"

The Augsburg Confession, therefore, is the joint product of a spiritual and intellectual father and son, each unique in personal genius, while in complementary development and labors they were more than brothers.*

The chief human source of the content of the Confession was Luther, while Melanchthon was the responsible author of its order, and was its only direct composer.†

The doing of a work of enduring import among men presupposes an adequate and markedly providential preparation. Such a work is the Augsburg Confession, and such an adequate preparation was that of Luther and Melanchthon.

As our immediate concern is with the article treating of the Lord's Supper, we are directly concerned only with those ideas of philosophy, dogmatic and ecclesiastical theology, and Christian life, which had for them attractive, repulsive, or formative power.

Melanchthon, like Augustine, was a Platonist. He had, moreover, a scholar's thorough knowledge of ancient and medieval philosophy.

Luther was, for some years, a professor of philosophy at Wittenberg and lectured on Aristotle. His intellectual affinities,

*"Luther was much confirmed in his new convictions, by Melanchthon, who had independently by calm study arrived at the same conclusions. In the controversy with Eck, August, 1519, Melanchthon laid down the far-reaching principle that the Scriptures are the supreme rule of faith, and that we must not explain the Scriptures by the Fathers, but explain and judge the Fathers by the Scriptures. He discovered that even Ambrose, Jerome and Augustine had often erred in their exegesis. A little later (Sept. 1519), he raised the same charge against the councils, and maintained that a Catholic Christian could not be required to believe any thing that was not warranted by the Scriptures. He expressed doubts about transubstantiation and the whole fabric of the mass. His estimate of the supreme value of the Scriptures, especially of Paul, rose higher and higher and made him stronger and bolder in the conflict with mediaeval tradition.

Thus fortified by the learning of Melanchthon, etc., etc." Schaff, History of the Christian Church, Vol. VI, p. 204, also pp. 191 et seq.

†Melanchthon, of course, kept well in mind the Articles of Marburg, Schwabach, and Torgau, and the suggestions of his immediate associates at Augsburg; but the work composition was preëminently his.

however, were with Plato rather than with Aristotle. Luther came to know Plato mainly through the Fathers; who, like Justin Martyr, Iranæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Basil, Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, and Augustine, were more or less Platonic; and through Medieval Mysticism, which on its philosophical side was Platonic, being thus the counterpart of scholasticism, which was largely Aristotelian. Luther was a complete master of the ideas and subtleties of every variety of Medieval Scholasticism.*

On the intellectual side, Luther's special teachers were:

1. Aristotle: the encyclopedist of antiquity, founder of logic and ontology, and through but part of his writings the master-spirit of the medieval world for four centuries. His grammar, analysis, logic, metaphysics, dialectics and rhetoric—his method being more important than his content—were the instruments by which revealed truth was to be systematized and defended, and all unrevealed truth discovered.†

2. Plato: idealist, mystic, poet, synthesist, whose philosophical dreams seemed to the Fathers to have wonderful affinities with the truths revealed in Christ; whose highest-good, or God was "love"; like Aristotle, student of man as a social being, exponent of Greek Theism, teleology, and the soul's immortality; dfffering from Aristotle, his great pupil, rather in method than in content.

3. Scholastics. While they all were Luther's teachers yet the subtlest among them, the English William of Occam [†1347], was such pre-eminently. He was a Nominalist, op-

*If the Scholastics deserved such high-flown titles as "doctor angelicus (Aquinas), seraphicus (Bonaventura), subtillissimus, (Duna Scotus), Christianissimus (Gerson), invincibilis (Occam.), etc.. then Luther deserved them all, for in logical vigor, dialectical skill, profundity of thought, biblical knowledge, spiritual insight, height and depth of religious experience, he excelled all schoolmen, mystics and saints of the mediæval period. He knew D'Ailly and Biel "almost by heart," says Melanchthon, and preferred them and Occam to Aquinas and Scotus.

†Luther's occasional savage denunciations of Aristotle were occasioned by the use made by scholastics of his "method" to defend and enforce corrupt Roman doctrine.

ponent of transubstantiation; bold enough to challenge the Church's authority in both state and spiritual affairs, and to appeal to a General Council; inventor of many terms which Luther found useful in setting forth his philosophical and theological conceptions of the person of Christ and of the Lord's Supper, he remained for Luther "the chief and most highly gifted of all the scholastic doctors."

4. Humanists. The humanists made Luther a classical scholar. The spirit of Luther was above all else religious. For a time, humanists could be his teachers to direct him to, and fit him for, higher things, while they remained on the lower plain of refined and elegant paganism. Humanist and Luther! How different in spirit! The one of the world, the other of Christ. Yet, how needful the humanist in the making of our Luther. The Alpine climber must needs have a staff.

The influence of Mysticism on Luther and his doctrine must be kept in mind. If one may speak positively of so elusive a thing, it may be said that Luther was a thorough master of mysticism. This can only be said of one who is much of mystic himself. Such was Luther. But there are mystics and mystics. He was of that class who never lose their sober selves in their intense desire for, or consciousness of, communion with God.

Medieval Mysticism, being rooted in Neo-Platonism, was the natural counterpart of Scholasticism which was rooted in Aristotelianism.

Its affinities are with John rather than with Paul, though Paul too has mystic elements. John's logos-doctrine, his exaltation of love, his personal traits; all mean far more to the mystic than the logical, discursive, doctrinal, yet withal intensely active, practical, spiritual teachings of Paul. On its extravagant side, mysticism is accountable for Gnosticism, the Pseudo-Dyonisius, many of the wild fantasies and sects of the Middle Ages, and for the Anabaptists and "Heavenly Prophets" of the Reformation era.*

*"The German mysticism of the Middle Ages was animated by an aspiration which points in the direction of a true religious experience of the

Mediaeval Mysticism is directly related to the Pseudo Dyonisius as translated by John Scotus Erigena, c. 850.* It was throughout the subjective side of Scholasticism."

On its sober side it produced some of the greatest characters and works of the Middle Ages. Many of the scholastics were mystics as well. To it we owe many of the great medieval hymns†—as yet unsurpassed in their fields—the Imitation of Christ, the sermons of Tauler, the Theologia Germanica and much of the devoutness, fraternity and charity of the Middle Ages.

Every phase of mysticism as previously developed was understood by Luther. Much as he was influenced and enriched by it,—and he was all his life a mystic—he was never unbalanced by it. Though he often felt that he was directly conscious of God, and had direct communion with him, yet he never once fancied himself above the Church with her word and sacraments and her providential historical development, or lost himself in the rapt desire of ecstatic mysticism to be "drunk with God." To him, life was a believing, divinely directed service rather than "sanctified" languor or rapt, ecstatic contemplation and transport.

Mysticism is a part of all true religion. It is a vital part of Christianity. It has clear affinities with the Lutheran view of the Lord's Supper. A full-orbed man with Christian experiences like Luther, could not but recognize the mystic elements in the Eucharist. A rationalist like Zwingli, and a legal-theologico logician like Calvin and the systems they originated, necessarily have but a meagre appreciation of the mystic elements in Christian ordinances, truth, and life.

'indwelling of God,' the aspiration was rather that of a creature seeking communion with his Creator, than that of a sinner seeking reconciliation with his righteous God and Judge." British *Quarterly*, 1872, p. 25.

*His works "wrought like a spell upon the mediaeval church, especially upon the mystics of the twelfth century. * * * The φυγη μόνου προς μονον of Plotinus expresses the inmost heart of Mysticism." Farrar, History of Interpretation, p. 255.

†They hymn Christ with mystic love and devotion. The great hymns on heaven are surcharged with mystic longing—home-sickness for heaven.

Luther and Melanchthon had an adequate knowledge of the opinions held upon the Lord's Supper throughout the whole range of Christian history.* They found that the Fathers held well nigh universally, though not always with consistency and never in complete theological definition and system, an actual objective and bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist.†

The occasional use, by some Fathers, of such terms as: transitio, transmutatio, convertio substantiae, and *μετα βολὴ*; are, at least, suggestive of transubstantiation; though the one thing to be said with assurance about the Fathers is, that they taught a real and bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist.‡

*Luther had Melanchthon and others make further and ample collections of the pertinent passages in the Fathers in 1525.

†Typical quotations from the Fathers:

Ignatius. The Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, and which the Father of his goodness raised up again. Ante-Nic. Fathers, Vol. I, p. 89.

Justin Martyr. And this food is called among us *Εὐχαριστια*, of which no one is allowed to partake but the man who believes that the things which we teach are true, and who has been washed with the washing that is for the remission of sins, and unto regeneration, and who is so living as Christ has enjoined. For not as common bread and common drink do we receive these; but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour, having been made flesh by the word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of his word, and from which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh. Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. I, p. 185. The Scotch editors say: "This passage is claimed alike by Calvinists, Lutherans and Romanists."

Iranaeus. "If the body were not also to be saved, for what purpose should it then be fed with the body and blood of the Lord in the sacrament?" Quoted by Luther, K. 2 : 126, cf. Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. I, 527–8.

Gelasius Bp. of Rome 490. By the sacraments we are made partakers of the divine nature, and yet the substance and nature of bread and wine do not cease to be in them. Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. I, p. 185.

‡The selections of Pusey from the Fathers abundantly prove this; even though they are made after the manner of a special pleader rather of an impartial scholar. Cf. Lias's, Nicene Creed, Neander, Hagenbach, Early Christian Liturgies and the Ante-Nicene, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers in loco.

Paschasius Radbertus in the ninth century and Lanfranc in the eleventh, taught the doctrine of transubstantiation. In this they were followed by most of the Scholastics. The doctrine was approved by the fourth Lateran Council (1215), held under Innocent III, in the following terms, in which the word *consubstantiation* appears to have been first authoritatively used: "Una vero est fidelium universalis ecclesia, extra quam omnino salvatur, in qua idem ipse sacerdos et sacrificium Jesus Christus, cujus corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur, *transubstantiatis* pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem, potestate divina, ut ad perficiendum mysterium unitatis accipiamus ipsi de suo, quod accepit ipse de nostro. Et hoc utique sacramentum nemo potest conficere, nisi sacerdos, qui fuerit rite ordinatus secundum claves ecclesiae, quas ipse concessit apostolis et eorum successoribus Jesus Christus.*

The Roman Catholic Church, 236 years later, in setting forth her distinctive creed as a section of Christendom, taught transubstantiation as follows: And because that Christ, our Redeemer, declared that which he offered under the species of bread to be truly his own body, therefore has it ever been a firm belief in the Church of God, and this holy Synod doth declare it anew, that, by the consecration of the bread and the wine, a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood; which conversion is, by the holy Catholic Church, suitably and properly called Transubstantiation.†

Transubstantiation requires belief in such magical transformations of the bread and wine, as deceive the senses of sight, taste, touch and smell; in the performance of numberless miracles by priests, in that they repeat the sacrifice of Christ for sin at every mass, and in an exegesis baldly and crudely literal.‡

*Hefele, Vol. V, 879.

†Decree of Tridentine Council, Oct. 11, 1551, Schaff's Creeds of Christendom, Vol. II, 130.

‡The acceptance of transubstantiation as theoretically true, naturally led to the denial of the cup to the laity through a sense of awe, the doc-

Between the Lateran Council (1215) and the Reformation, opposition to it appeared in various quarters. John of Paris, Durandus, Wickliffe, Jerome of Prague, John Wessel and Occam, may be mentioned. Of these Occam and Durandus are of special interest to us because of similarities to Luther and Melanchthon.*

The relation of Luther to Occam is so important as to call for a special consideration.

Occam was Regius Prof. of theology and intellectual head of the University of Paris; exponent of the Byzantine logic; restorer of Nominalism; of a questioning, critical and free if not of a skeptical spirit; author of the reply to Boniface's Unam Sanctam; accepted as a dogma whatever the Church said was revealed, yet, withal, refusing to be bound by Pope or Council; theorizing with the utmost subtlety and daring about all theological questions; a great student of the Bible; a mystic; a Franciscan monk; a devout and ascetic imitator of Christ after a monkish fashion; a product of the Middle Ages, an embodiment of much of its intellect and heart, yet a mighty force in its destruction.†

This Occam, who was scholastic, mystic, orthodox in dogma, untrammeled in speculation, sapper of papal authority in state and church, ascetic monk, excommunicated, advance promoter of a new era with whose inner life he could have no kinship, yet meant more than any other scholastic to Luther and to his satisfactory and complete presentation of the doctrine of the eucharist. Luther refers to him "mein Meister Occam" and "mein

trine of comcomitance, to the adoration of the host, (thirteenth century), the legends of the host bleeding its appearance in the form of a lamb, its causing the death of animals, etc.

*"None of the scholastics entertained views more nearly allied to those of Luther than Durandus." Cramer in Hagenbach, Vol. II, 360. Rupert of Deutz, [† 1135] held to a "wonderful union of Christ's body with the bread, but without any disturbance of the sensible elements." He called the bread, very expressively, *Deifer panis.* Hagenbach.

†His offer to the Emperor Lewis of Bavaria in his contest with the Pope was: "Tu me defende gladio, ego te defendam calamo." "In his Epistola Defensoria he became the earliest defender of the liberty of the Press."

lieber Meister Occam." In such important works as the Babylonian Captivity and the Grosses Bekenntniss vom Abendmahl, he refers to him and uses him freely. Melanchthon says that Luther, "Gabrielem et Cameracensum [Biel and D'Ailly] pene ad verbum memoriter recitare poterat. Diu multum legit scripta Occam, huius acumen anteferebat Thomae et Scotae." *

The following teachings of Occam as found in his De Sacramento Altaris, were directly copied and used by Luther in his controversies with Zwingli and Œcolampadius.

In his "dogma" of the eucharist Occam said the "accidents" remained while the "substance" disappeared. Luther agreed with the former but not the latter.

Occam held to a local or "circumscriptive," to an illocal or "definitive" and to a majestical or divine mode of presence. The "definitive" specially explains the presence of Christ in the eucharist.

"The soul is in the body 'definitive.' It is in the body, and the whole of it is in every part of it." "The co-existence of the body of Christ with the closed doors are examples of the same co-existence of two substances in one place."

"Christ's body is present in, with and under, the species of bread and wine. Each [the body of Christ and the bread] is distinct, *i. e.* moving the host did not move the body. Moving the body did not necessarily move the host, that depended upon the will of Christ, who was conscious of his bodily presence in the host and willed that his body should move as the host did."

Occam's language is: Dico quod esse in loco accipitur dupliciter, scilicet circumscriptive et definitive. Circumscriptive in loco est aliquid in loco, cujus pars est in parte loci et totum in toto loco; definitive autem esse in loco est, quando totum est in toto loco, et non extra, et totum est in qualibet parte illius loci.

Ita enim tenemus, quod anima intellectiva est tota in toto corpore, et qualibet parte ejus, nec oppositum potest per rationem demonstrativam probari. Sic etiam tenemus quod angelus est totus in aliquo loco definitive et in qualibet parte; per idem non

*Vita Lutheri Vitenberg, 1549.

debet etiam aliquis negare, quin per divinam potentiam possint duo corpora, tam ejusdem specei speciallissimae, quam diversae, simul eidem loco coexistere. Sic enim Salvator Jesus Christus clausis januis intravit ad discipulos, et clauso utero virginis exivit in mundum, et nullo diviso corpore celesti in coelum ascendit.

Occam taught the ubiquity of Christ's body. "The real theory of Occam was, that the body of Christ is contained in the host, in the same manner in which soul and body together occupy one and the same space."*

The specific development of Luther's doctrine of the Eucharist may be said to extend from 1515 to 1530. Some early sermons, the Babylonian Captivity, Letters to the Bohemians, the Saxon Articles of Melanchthon approved by him, his controversies with the "Sacramentarians," his writings to the "Mediators" Bucer, Hedio *et al.*, his Grosses Bekenntniss vom Abendmahl 1528, the Catechisms of 1529, the meetings with their resultant Articles at Marburg, Schwabach and Torgau, the Augsburg Confession of 1530, indicate in part his theological and literary activity and his steady progress towards a ripe and complete consistency.

Early in this period he finally rejected transubstantiation.† His conservatism in holding fast to the general historical consensus of opinion in Christendom in favor of a real presence, while repudiating transubstantiation as a corruption, did not satisfy the extreme and fanatical spirits that arose at the heels of the Reformation. Honius, Carlstadt, the "Heavenly Prophets," and Zwingli, were alike in this, that they found Luther not "evangelical" and "spiritual" enough for them, and at least measurably justify Luther in classing them together.

Luther developed his doctrine, in harmony with what he be-

*Rettberg cited by Hagenbach, cf. Rettberg on Luther and Occam in Studien und Kritiken, 1839, and Occam and the Reformation in *British Quarterly Review*, Vol. 58.

†In the Babylonian Captivity (1520) Luther combats the doctrine of Transubstantiation, in a way that shows him an easy vanquisher of the subtleties of Aquinas and all its other scholastic defenders.

lieved to be the teachings of the word of God and the consensus of the Fathers, avoiding on the one side the extreme of transubstantiation and on the other the extremes of Carlstadt and the "Prophets," of Honius and Zwingli. His treatment of the mediating party of Bucer, shows how broad and conciliatory he was when not asked to give up what was to him the truth of God's word.

His position in regard to the Church, in its historic continuity and life under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, is shown in the following sentiment: "That it is very dangerous to infer that Christendom was through so many centuries without a true understanding of the sacrament, inasmuch as we all acknowledge that the sacraments and the Word, although covered over with many abominable practices, have nevetheless been preserved."

Luther's Grosses Bekenntniss vom Abendmahl Christi, 1528, in which he refutes Zwingli's "figurative interpretation of the words of institution and his Christology, more thoroughly, keenly and absolutely than elsewhere" (Kœstlin), marks his maturity; though later he relied, for his doctrine of the Eucharist, more completely upon his direct exegesis and so somewhat less upon his Christology.

Several features of the Zwinglian view here combatted by Luther will be noticed.*

*Zwingli prepared a statement of his doctrines to present at Augsburg, 1530, but was not allowed to do so. He called it, Fidei Ratio. A brief quotation will suffice to show his spirit. "I believe, yea I know, that all the sacraments are so far from conferring grace that they do not even convey or distribute it. Sec. 7.

I believe that in the holy Eucharist—*i. e.* the supper of thanksgiving—the true body of Christ is present by the contemplation of faith; *i. e.* that they who thank the Lord for the kindness conferred on us in his Son acknowledge that he assumed true flesh, in it truly suffered, truly washed away our sin in his own blood; and thus everything done by Christ becomes present to them by the contemplation of faith. But that the body of Christ in essence and really—*i. e*, the natural body itself—is either present in the Supper or masticated with our mouth and teeth, as the Papists and some who long for the flesh-pots of Egypt assert, we not only deny, but firmly maintain is an error opposed to God's word. This, with the divine assistance, I will in a few words, O Emperor, make as clear as

1. In Zwingli's exegesis, *is* was equivalent to signifies. Luther's rule of interpretation was: "In the Scripture, we should allow the words to retain their natural force, as they read, according to the style, and assign no other signification to them, unless required by an evident article of faith."* He rightly doubted whether the usage of "any language on earth" justified the Zwinglian position.†

2. To the view that the words, "This is my body," were figurative, and intended merely to suggest devout meditation upon

the sun. First, by citing the divine oracles; secondly, by attacking the adversaries with arguments derived therefrom, as with military engines; lastly, by showing that the ancient theologians held our opinion." Section 8. Jacobs, Book of Concord. "The easiest way of explaining is to say it is a figure of speech; but this explanation explains nothing." Delitzsch on Ps. 148.

*Luther on the Sacraments, New Market, p. 287.

†The following additional quotations from Luther more fully exhibit his exegetical principles:

"The literal sense of Scripture alone is the whole essence of faith and of Christian theology."

"I have observed this, that all heresies and errors have originated, not from the simple words of Scripture, as is so universally asserted, but from *neglecting* the simple words of Scripture, and from the affectation of purely subjective tropes and inferences."

"The science of theology is nothing else than grammar applied to the words of the Holy Spirit."

"He insists (1) on the necessity for grammatical knowledge; (2) on the importance of taking into consideration times, circumstances and conditions; (3) on the observance of the context; (4) on the need of faith and spiritual illumination; (5) on keeping the 'proportion of faith' and (6) on the reference of all Scripture to Christ." Quoted by Farrar in History of Interpretation.

Most of these principles he applied in the controversy with the Zwinglians. It was hard for him to believe in the orthodoxy and sincerity of Zwingli. He seemed a trifler to Luther and to Melanchthon. Certainly no Herder will ever say of him, as of Luther: "The man took everything so largely and heartily, * * The whole man ever feeling the word of God, whose speech is always the word of God, and the state of the Church, who feels all things as great serious facts, and contends for them—this is the man who stands before us." Herder, 206, K, 2.

"Melanchthon's most important services as an exegete were philological and theological. He says 'ignavus in grammatica est ignavus in theologia.'" Farrar ut supra.

the death of Christ on the cross, Luther objects that this makes the words of institution unnecessary, as without them Christians would meditate upon his death, and that the words "broken for you," do not refer as much to Christ's suffering upon the cross, as to the distribution in the Eucharist. There is, therefore, neither need of, nor fitness in, the figurative interpretation of Zwingli and Œcolampadius. Their "spiritual" eating and drinking is merely faith.

3. The Zwinglians contended that Christ could not be present in the eucharist and at the same time "sit at the right hand of God."

"Luther here encountered the Zwinglian doctrine of *Allœosis*. If the Scriptures, when speaking of one nature of Christ, employ expressions which really apply only to the other, and, accordingly, without discrimination affirm now of one and now of the other nature the conditions and activities described, this is, in the opinion of Zwingli, a mere form of speech, which he designates *Allœosis*. Thus, as Luther describes the theory, the Scriptures are supposed simply to take the one nature for the other, whilst each of the natures, in reality, yet remains so distinct from the other as to retain only its own characteristic modes of activity. Against this *Allœosis* Luther cannot too earnestly warn. He calls it the devil's mask. He declares that it is an entirely arbitrary invention of Zwingli, without any evidence from Scripture. Its grandmother is the old sorceress, Dame Reason. And he turns at once against it the force of the fundamental interest of Christian faith. When the Scriptures speak of the sufferings of Christ, this is, according to Zwingli, to be understood only of his human nature. But, in this case, Christ accomplishes nothing more by his sufferings than any other mere saint. If only the human nature suffered for us, then is Christ a poor Saviour, and stands in need, indeed, of a Saviour for himself. If the person of Christ is divided, as this accursed *Allœosis* teaches, the whole Christian faith and the salvation of the world are at once swept away. He himself finds the explanation of the fact, that the Scriptures ascribe to the humanity of Christ that which affects the divinity, and the re-

verse, in the actual union (unification) into which the divinity has entered with the humanity in the person of Christ. Divinity and humanity are in Christ one person. The person, Christ, is true God. If Christ now suffer, we may rightly say that the Son of God suffers: that is to say, the one part, the divinity, does not, indeed, suffer; but the person, who is God, suffers in the other part, namely, the humanity. It is as though we should say, "The king's son is wounded," although it is only his leg that is wounded; or, "Absalom is beautiful," although it is only his body that is beautiful. Since body and soul are one person, whatever befalls either the body or the soul, or even the smallest member of the body, is rightly ascribed to the whole person. Just in this way we are to apply to the entire person of Christ, in which divinity and humanity make one person, whatever befalls either part of the person, because the two are but one person. We do not mingle the two natures into one nature. We do not say that divinity is humanity, or that the divine nature is human nature. But we mingle the *two different natures* into one *single person*, and say: God is man; man is God. By means of the *Allœosis*, on the contrary, the person of Christ is divided, as though there were two persons. When, for example, the passages which speak of suffering are applied to the human nature alone, then, since not the nature, but the person, is the subject of the activity or suffering, Christ must be two persons."*

Luther holds, over against Zwingli's *allœosis:*

1. Christ's existence in heaven and his presence in the Eucharist are not contradictory for "the former involves the ubiquity of his body."

2. The right hand of God is everywhere. Jesus Christ is essentially natural, true, complete God and man in One person, unseparated and undivided. Since his humanity has become

*With unremitting industry, and with an acuteness which no opponent of the Lutheran Doctrine was able to deny, Luther criticized the interpretation of the Swiss Reformers, tore to pieces their arguments, and in a masterly way revealed the points of weakness presented, especially in Zwingli's "significat," and in the array of supposed analogous forms of speech. Koestlin's Luther's Theology, vol. 2, 133.

one person with God, and so entirely and altogether taken up into God above all creatures that he, as it were, clings to him, it is, therefore, not possible that the God could be anywhere where he would not be man. The two natures are so united with one another that they belong together more intimately than soul and body; and, accordingly, Christ must also be man wherever he is God. But the right hand of God, and Christ, by virtue of his sitting at the right hand of God and by virtue of his own essential divinity, are everywhere. In these declarations Luther again, referring to John 3 : 13, includes also the period of Christ's earthly life."*

3. Luther teaches that by virtue of the union of the divine and human in Christ, "the omnipresence, which belongs in the first instance to the one part, *i. e.*, the divinity, and which is further said, according to the previous section referred to, to belong to the person of Christ with reference to this one part, must have also passed over to the humanity itself. Thus we have found the Christological basis of Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper again unfolded in his Confession."—(Köstlin.)

4. Luther holds that "God in order to be at any one place, is by no means bound to a local presence."

He holds to "three modes of being in one place," *i. e.*, locally or circumscriptively, definitively and repletively.

A local, circumscriptive or comprehensive presence is such as

*"He charges upon Zwingli, who denied that the body of Christ is present wherever God is, and thus at the same time in heaven and on earth, that his coarse spirit knows nothing of what it means to "be in heaven," and he appeals to the fact that Christ was then already, according to John 3 : 13, at the same time in heaven. And he expressly adds, that this applies also to the humanity of Christ from the time of his existence in his mother's womb. It was higher and deeper in God than any angel, and hence, also, higher in heaven. According to this, there is left between the states of Christ, as walking upon the earth and exalted in heaven, only the difference, that his humanity in the former state, although then already the above-depicted consequences of its union with the divinity pertained to it, yet, at the same time, revealed itself in external visibility and humble form at one particular place on earth." Koestlin.

can be measured, or covered, as wine and its vessel. "In this way the body of Christ was present when he, walking upon the earth, filled or vacated space equal to the size of his body." In this way, Christ appeared after his resurrection, and may appear when he so desires, and will appear at the Last Day.

"A thing is present *definitively*, or *in an incomprehensible manner*, when it is at a *certain definite place*, *which place is corporeal and comprehensible* and has its dimensions in space, its length, breadth and thickness, but when *the said thing is not of itself present in a comprehensible manner*, cannot be measured by the dimensions of the place, and has itself neither length nor breadth."*

This mode specially explains the presence of Christ in the eucharist as has been seen from Occam and Luther's use of him.

Luther holds also to a *repletive*, *majestic* presence, or omnipresence. "A thing is repletively, or supernaturally, at places when it is at the same time, in its entirety and completeness, at all places, and fills all places, and yet is bounded and comprehended by no place; as God is, in Jer. 23 : 23, said to be a God near at hand, and not afar off, since he fills heaven and earth. Just in this manner must Christ also, (since he must be as man wherever he is as God,) be present everywhere with his humanity, according to this supernatural, divine mode of presence. According to this third mode, all created things are for him yet far more penetrable and more truly present than according to the second. If he can, according to the second mode, be in created things without being measured or comprehended by them, much more is he then wonderfully in them according to the third mode, so that not only do they not measure or comprehend him, but he, on the contrary, has them present before him, measures and comprehends them. We must locate this, his nature, since he is one with God, far—very far—without and beyond all created things, as far as God is without and beyond them, and yet, again, as

*The term "in" as applied to the presence of God does not mean a comprepensible inclusion "like straw in a bag and bread in a basket." On "these subjects it is equivalent to over, beyond, under, through and through, and everywhere." Luther on Sacraments, New Market, p. 235.

deeply in and near all created things as God is within them."*—(Köstlin.)

To say that the presence of Christ in the Eucharist is sacramental is to say that it is unique, and that it cannot be fully illustrated by anything else, otherwise the sacrament itself would be no addition to our means of grace, and would, therefore, be a useless thing. The Chalcedon Christology furnished Occam and Luther an illustration in the co-existence of God and man in the person of Christ; the union of soul and body in man, furnished another. In our day, applied science furnishes one that may possibly prove serviceable. In the communication of electric power, electricity may be said to be in, with and under, the wire; in that the wire remains wire, yet without it, there would not be the presence and the communication of the electricity: just as the bread, though remaining bread, is that without which there could be no sacramental presence of the body of Christ.

The presence of the electricity in the wire is measurably dependent upon the will of man, the presence of the body of Christ in the Eucharist is, however, dependent entirely upon the will of Christ himself. He has made the Eucharist one of the means by which he graciously imparts himself to his own.

The "live wire" is both wire and electricity. It is "wire-electricity," that is, wire and electricity united "invisibly, unconfusedly, unmixedly" and illocally. The sacramental bread is "body-bread," as the sacramental wine is "blood-wine," *i. e.*, by

*"Luther speaks with great contempt of the contracted conception held by his opponents of the divine presence in general. The divinity is, according to their notion, present everywhere in the corporeal, comprehensible manner (*localiter*), just as though God were a sort of great extended something, reaching through all creatures and out beyond them, filling the world and sticking out beyond it like the straw in an over-full straw-sack. In confutation of this, he repeats the declaration that God is not such a stretched-out being, with special dimensions, but a supernatural, inscrutable Being, present entire and complete in every grain of corn, and yet in and above and beyond all created things. *When we speak of the presence of God, the word "in" does not mean a comprehensible inclusion, as in a bag or basket, but it signifies all that we understand by "above, beyond, beneath, through and through again, and everywhere."* Koestlin.

the mighty word and will of Christ and by his Holy Spirit, Christ and the elements are connected, invisibly, unmixedly, illocally, sacramentally, mystically, yet most really, at the will of Christ himself.*

If it be agreed that "is" means signifies, it does not follow that the only thing signified is the absent body of Christ localized in heaven, or the body of Christ once broken on the cross for us. One might take *is*, to be, not the copula of being, as Luther held, but the equivalent of *signifies*, as Honius and Zwingli taught, and still deduce from it the essentials of the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist.

In baptism the sacramental use of the visible, material element water, signifies the inner cleansing which is the regeneration wrought by the invisible but actual supernatural presence and power of the Holy Spirit. So in the Eucharist the sacramental use of the visible, material elements would signify the invisible but actual presence of Christ as the food of the soul.†

To say less would be to say that God gives his people a sign but denies them the thing signified, which is the thing of real value and desire. God's way, however, has always been to give his people a sign that they may be the more sure of the reality. Thus the use of the sacrificial lamb under the Old Covenant, was intended to aid his people in apprehending the offering of Christ, *the* Lamb of God, as a sacrifice for sin.

So, after all, unless one agrees to the principle, that to say a passage of the word of God, is figurative, means to make it void of all content, the question is still open as to what is actually meant by the figurative expression.

*Perhaps, however, in speaking thus of wire and electricity, one is in danger of being clubbed with such verbal bludgeons as *con*—, *sub*—, *im*—, *trans*—.

†Zwingli himself agreed to this principle when he signed the Marburg articles with Luther. The ninth treats of baptism as follows: "That Holy Baptism is a sacrament, that has been instituted of God for this faith, and because God's command: 'Go ye, baptize,' Matt. 28 : 19, and God's promise: 'He that believeth,' Mark 16 : 16, is therein, it is not a mere empty sign or symbol among Christians, *but a sign and work of God*, wherein our faith is required, *through which we are regenerated.*"

With some, to understand a passage "figuratively" or "spiritually" is simply a "process of evaporation, or explaining away." The fact is, the purpose of figures is to make truth more vivid, and forceful, while "to spiritualize is to intensify." The question then is whether it is not more in harmony with the analogy of Scripture to say that the expression: "This signifies my body broken for you," means the body of Christ present, given to, and shared by, the communicants, rather than a mere memorial of a body broken over 1800 years ago and ever since absolutely localized in heaven and which can only be received "spiritually;" that is, can only be thought about in devout meditation and imagination.

In the light of the historic survey presented, assuming that it has been sufficiently ample to justify it, a somewhat succinct statement of the eucharistic doctrine held by the Confessors at Augsburg, may be made. No attempt will be made to make this statement exhaustive.

1. By the Lord's Supper is meant, the celebration by Christians of the eucharistic rite, especially the repetition of the words of institution and the distribution of the bread and wine, according to the command of Christ.

2. The presence asserted is that of the true body and blood of Christ. The Christology upon which this is based is that of the Fathers, of Chalcedon,* and of the New Testament. This

**Council of Chalcedon.* Schaff, Creeds of Chris. II, 62, 63. 451 A. D. Following the Holy Fathers, we all with one consent teach men to confess one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, the same perfect in Godhead and also perfect in manhood; truly God and truly man, of a reasonable [rational] soul and body; consubstantial [coessential] with the Father according to the Godhead, and consubstantial with us according to the Manhood; in all things like unto us, without sin; begotten before all ages of the Father according to the Godhead, and in these latter days for us and for our salvation, born of the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, according to the Manhood; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, to be acknowledged in two natures, *inconfusedly*, *unchangeably*, *indivisibly*, *inseparably;* the distinction of natures being by no means taken away by the union, but rather the property of each nature being preserved, and concurring in one Person and one Subsistence, not parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son and only-begotten,

Christology was substantially reproduced in the Schwabach Articles: "The Son of God, true God and man, Jesus Christ, *is a single, inseparable person*, who suffered for us men, died, ascended to heaven, sitteth at the right hand of God, Lord over all creation; so that we are not to believe that Jesus Christ suffered for us as the man, or the human nature: but since God and man are not here two persons, but One inseparable person we are to teach that God and man, or the Son of God truly suffered for us." The eucharistic presence is set forth as follows: That here is present in the bread and in the wine the true body and blood of Christ, according to the words: This is my body, this is my blood.—(*Jacobs*, Book of Concord, vol. II.)

3. The cause of this presence is the word and will of Christ. Since Christ is God, his word is omnipotent. As the Holy Spirit is ever in and with the word, the presence may also be said to be caused by him. In the institution of the sacrament and in the nature he gave it, Christ declared his will to be present in it.

4. The nature of the presence is:

(1) Objective. As the sacrament is a gracious institution and gift of Christ to his Church, it could not be otherwise than objective.

(2) Real: Actual, not merely "figurative" or "spiritual."

(3) True. The Christ, himself, as verily present, as his word is potent and true. Not a presence having no other reality than devout imagination or contemplation.

(4) Substantial. Essential. In his very essence—his true nature and being, as the God-man. "God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds: and Man of the substance of his mother, born in the world; Perfect God, and perfect man: One, by taking the manhood into God." One Christ. One person, of two natures in inseparable union. His substantial presence is of his very self.

(5) Corporeal. Bodily. According to Christ's own word:

God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ; as the prophets from the beginning [have declared] concerning him, and the Lord Jesus Christ himself has taught us, and the Creed of the holy Fathers has handed down to us.

This is my body given for you; he is present, to be given and received in the Holy Communion, with the body prepared for him and to which, in unity of person, he is inseparably united, that body being in all essentials identical with the one which was crucified.

(6) Personal. That is, in his own, proper, complete and unique person. The Son of God and the Son of Man, in unity of person: Godhead and humanity in one unique person, our Redeemer, Saviour and Lord, verily present in the Eucharist, to communicate himself to man.

(7) In, with and under, the form (Gestalt) of bread and wine. "Two things are exhibited and received together, the one earthly, that is, bread and wine, and one heavenly, that is, the body and blood of Christ."* Where the bread and wine, the repetition of the words of institution and the distribution and reception are, according to Christ's command, there is the sacrament. Where the sacrament is, the presence of Christ is. Where the sacrament is not, the special sacramental presence of Christ is not. No sacramental bread and wine, no sacramental presence of Christ. With the seen sacramental bread and wine, the unseen, but actual sacramental presence of Christ. A presence, however, no more fixed or localized than that of electricity in the wire, which it uses as the agent of its presence and the vehicle of its power.

(8) Mystical. *Not magical.* Not apparent to the senses, nor discoverable by the methods of science or the processes of the reason, yet real in itself and realizable to the mind and spirit, through assurance of faith and personal experience.

(9) Supernatural. Christianity is supernatural. Any communication of Christian grace is supernatural. If the Lord's Supper be a sacrament, it must offer and convey special grace. This can only be done by a particular divine presence with its associated exercise of divine power. God in Christ is specially, that is, supernaturally present to convey, and to be himself, the grace of this sacrament.

*The Saxon *Confession*, thus "adapts Irenaeus' language." Lias, p. 323.

NEGATIVE.

A. The presence is not:

(1) Local, that is, circumscriptive, comprehensive, or such as occupies measurable space.

(2) By *Impanation and Invination;* that is, any local, "spatial," physical or measurable inclusion, particle by particle or otherwise, of any part of the body and blood of Christ physically within the bread and wine.*

(3) By Consubstantition (*Συνουσια*), a joining or adhering to, or mingling with in any local, physical or comprehensible sense, or a uniting of body with bread or blood with wine, so as to form another resultant substance.

(4) By Transubstantiation, (*Μετουσια*), that is, the actual transmuting of the bread and wine into the true substance of the body of Christ, while the "accidents" remain, this being done by the consecrating power of the priest.†

(5) A Durabilis Conjunctio, the continuous union of the very substance of Christ, with the accidents of bread and wine, beyond the period of the sacramental rite, (from which may follow the "reservation" of the consecrated host as "venerable" in the monstrance and like practices.)

(6) A sacrifice, that is, an actual, supernatural offering and oblation of Christ, in the mass, for the sins of the living or the dead, as a repetition of his vicarious sacrifice on the cross. (The basis of Rome's profitable traffic in private and public masses.)

(7) Such a presence as justifies, the elevation, carrying or adoration of the host, as in the ceremonies of the mass and on Corpus Christi day.‡

(8) Such a "concomitance" as justifies the withholding of the cup from the laity.

*Ruprecht of Deutz, † 1135, was the first to teach impanation. He did it in opposing transubstantiation. The word appears to have been first used by Alger of Liege, † 1131.

†Transubstantiation would be really magic, since the distinctions of the scholastics between substance and accident are philosophically false.

‡The festival of Corpus Christi was instituted in 1264 by Urban IV in honor of transubstantiation. It originated in a "vision" of the nun Juliana.

B. (1) Subjective. That is, a presence within the believer, by virtue of his own personal, active, pious imagination, recollection, meditation or faith in connection with the sacramental rites; *as opposed to and a denial of*, any objective and substantial presence of Christ in the sacrament.

(2) *a.* "Virtual," as opposed to a real, true and substantial presence.

b. "Spiritual," that is merely as "potential," by Christ's "Spirit" apart from his person, or "the present in spirit" of an interested well-wisher who is actually absent, as opposed to any truly personal presence of the Incarnate-logos.

c. Divine (only), as opposed to that of Christ in his complete divine-human (theanthropic) person.

5. By whom received.

Christ being present in the sacrament, by the power of his omnipotent word and his own gracious will, he is communicated to all who partake of the bread and wine, [distribuantur vescentibus, ausgetheilt und genommen wird, as in the Confession.]* It is, however, the worthy communicant alone who in eating and drinking receives the grace and benefit of the sacrament. The unworthy, "eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself."†

6. Mode of reception.

(1) Orally, that is, the heavenly elements being communicated with the earthly in the sacrament, the reception is necessarily with the mouth, and by all communicants. Our present body is a *ψυχικον-σωμα*. It is the agent by which the *πνευμα* receives the preached, the written, and the sacramental word.‡

But very important is the truth, that, with the worthy communicant, "*the mouth eats bodily for the heart.*"—Luther.

(2) Spiritual, *i. e.* it is with the spirit or, preferably, the

*"Exhibeantur cum illis rebus, quae videntur, pane et vino, his, qui sacramentum accipiunt." Apology. "Quod cum pane et vino vere exhibeantur corpus et sanguis Christi vescentibus in Coeda Domini." Variata of 1540.

†1 Cor. 10 : 16, and 1 Cor. 11 : 27–29.

‡1 Cor. 15 : 44.

"heart"—the Christian's highest and deepest, innermost, self and being, wherein he is "likest unto God"—that the worthy communicant receives the Christ who comes to him in his blessed theanthropic person in the Holy Communion.

With Luther it must be said, that far more important than the mouth eating bodily for the heart, is the truth, that "the heart eats for the mouth, spiritually." The πνευμα will be more than the ψυχικόν-σωμα, at least until that becomes a πνευματικον-σωμα.*

(3) Sacramentally, in a manner peculiar to the sacrament; that is, with the word added to the appointed earthly elements, so they may be vehicles of the heavenly, eating and drinking them in obedience to Christ's command, assured that the special grace implied and promised in the sacrament will be received by the worthy communicant, with due and holy rites according to Christ's example and injunction.

7. The spiritual and sacramental reception includes various scriptural ideas that are a part of, or associated with, the celebration of the Eucharist; as the Lord's Supper is:

(1) A memorial, a grateful remembrancer of Christ, especially of his loving, vicarious, and atoning life and death for us.

(2) Sign and seal. The visible, bread and wine, fit food and drink for the body, in the sacrament become the index and assurance of the presence of the invisible Christ in gracious self-giving as the food of the soul.

(3) A Eucharist. A commemorative thanksgiving for Christ's full and perfect propitiatory offering. (Köstlin.) A joyous thanksgiving for his sacramental presence and the grace it conveys.

(4) A New Covenant. As Christ's shed blood inaugurated the New Covenant, so the blood of the sacrament bespeaks and seals the pardon of the sins of those to whom the sacrament is a renewal of their personal covenant.

(5) A Communion. (Koinonia.) A common or joint participation in, and sharing of, by Christians sacramentally of the

*1 Cor. 15 : 43–46.

body and blood of their Lord. A blessed fellowship of Christians with each other and with their Saviour.

(6) A Symbol. *a.* Christ's death. The breaking of the bread and the distributing of the wine shew forth the Lord's death till he come. The eucharistic celebration itself is a pleading of the merits of his atoning death.*

b. The unity of Christians—being many they yet are one bread and one body, for at the table of the Lord they all partake of one bread. 1 Cor. 10 : 17.

c. The love and fraternity of Christians.

d. A figure, promise and foretaste of the "feast of ingathering" in the Father's kingdom above.

(7) The Gospel in sacramental form. Remission of sins, life and salvation are offered him who believes the words, "given and shed for you for the remission of sins."†

(8) Food of immortality. Christ is the bread of life. To worthily partake of the sacrament is to have "an actual participation of life with the Lord." To worthily take the sacramental food is to live forever.

8. The aid of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is life-imparting. Without his aid the flesh profiteth nothing.‡ By his aid the communicant humbly but trustingly and confidently takes the bread and wine of the sacrament, along with them receiving Christ himself, and says in the joyous personal appropriation of a living faith, *for me, for the remission of my sins.*

*So he showed that sacrifice, self-surrender, death, is the beginning and the course and the aim and the essential principle of the higher life. To find life in our own way, to wish to save it, to seek to give it, to love it, is, he proclaims, to miss it altogether. Westcott, *Victory of the Cross*, p. 22.

†In the Unterricht der Visitatoren, etc., written by Melanchthon, and revised by Luther, A. D. 1528, (Erl. Ed., XXIII, 36), it is simply said, in entire harmony with the doctrinal views of Luther as we have thus far constantly found them expressed. In the words of the Lord's Supper forgiveness of sins is promised; and we obtain this, not through the outward partaking of the (true, present) body of Christ, but through faith which is awakened through the words and signs. Köstlin, 2, 149.

‡John 6 : 63. "A deeper meaning than the ordinary one that his teaching is to be, not carnally, but spiritually understood." Handy Commentary, Ed. by Ellicott, cf. 2 Cor. 3 : 6 where the letter, γραμμα, is said to kill, while the spirit, that is the life-giving Spirit, the Holy Spirit gives life.

Below this the humblest of God's children do not fall, above it the greatest cannot climb. To both alike it is a supreme gift of gracious love. Both alike make it a service of supreme self-dedication and worship.

9. *A Mystery.* After the final word shall have been said by the philosopher and the theologian, devout Christians will still agree with the Early Church in counting the Eucharist among the mysteries of the Christian faith. A faith that is of God must be too wonderful for man to fully attain unto it. Even what we call matter has been found to be crowded with properties, which, had they been revealed before this century, would have been counted supernatural. Matter, as we know it, finds its acme of beauty and perfection in the human body. With the human body, prepared for Christ in the womb of the Virgin, God and man are united "inconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly and inseparably." In the Eucharist, this person, in whom God, man and nature are one, is communicated to man, as the food of immortality. The exact manner of this presence and communication we do not, and cannot know here, for here we know God, spirit, and even matter, but in part.

Here is indeed a sublime mystery, before which man must ever stand in reverent awe, yet of which he may joyously partake; since the Lord, who is himself the feast, invites him to it. The faith of the lowliest, as well as that of the highest, simply says: As the Christ once offered himself for my sin, so now in the Holy Communion, he gives himself to me, that, through his indwelling I may be nourished unto eternal life.

For learned and unlearned alike, for the purest saint and the feeblest of believers, all benefit depends upon each one exercising a personally-appropriating faith in the words of Christ, "for you," "for the remission of sins."

If it be questioned whether the results of modern natural science have not added to the difficulties of the Christian in accepting a presence of the divine-human person of Christ in the Eucharist, it may be answered that while it is probable that no discoveries of man will be likely to clear away all difficulties or remove all mysteries, yet modern science has shown matter to

be divisible to an extent hitherto undreampt of, and to have properties of a most subtle character, hitherto unknown. These marvelous properties naturally suggest that matter itself may have yet undiscovered relations and affinities with spirit.

Even the daily press affords many pertinent illustrations, such as the following. The Boston *Herald* thus quotes Prof. Trowbridge of Harvard :

"A Crookes tube, is almost a perfect vacuum, and it is usually said that a vacuum does not conduct electricity ; but my experiments have shown that when the discharge which produces the *x*-rays is forced across the tube by a very high electrical pressure, the vacuum breaks down and conducts. This is the most striking thing that I have discovered, and it has never before been suspected by any one. At the moment before the charge goes over from one end of the tube to the other there is the greatest resistance, but, at the instance of going, there is hardly any resistance at all. The conclusion of all my work is that I have made it possible to compute energy in terms of horse power. The amount of energy required to produce the *x*-rays is 1,000,000 horse power, acting in one ten-millionth of a second. This is a computation which could never before be made. Hitherto the voltage required to cause the rays has been greatly underestimated. I have proved the amount necessary to start the rays to be at least 100,000 volts. The tremendous power in the *x*-rays shows us how they can go through brick walls and penetrate flesh."

It may, at least be said, that the discovery of the *x*-rays and their power to "go through brick walls" does not make it harder to believe that Christ, bodily, entered a room with the door closed.

Assuredly, the discoveries of modern physical science have added no new burden to faith. They have, however, made it distinctly easier to believe that God himself and the mighty acts of his redemptive work for man bear that immediate relation to the entire animate and inanimate creation indicated by Paul in Rom. 8 : 19–23, and in such Psalms as the 148, which make man only the chief beneficiary, among sentient creation, of

Christ's work, and which, in worshipful praise, make the "Church the choir leader of the universe." To a generation that accepted Drummond's Natural Law in the Spiritual World with calm avidity, and that scarcely became rippled over the discovery of the Röntgen rays, there surely must be a lighter tax on faith to accept the Lutheran doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist than to any preceding generation.

God has revealed himself largely through the objective and material, and it was only when God in Christ was made visible and tangible in material flesh and blood that the supreme problems of the origin, nature and destiny of man—his relations to the deity—could be satisfactorily answered.

Doubtless, with many, the revulsion from a view that assigns so important and so sacred a function to material elements, as being in direct association with, and vehicles whereby Christ in the Eucharist conveys himself to human hearts, is based upon their erroneous ideas of matter. They hold with heathen philosophers, the Gnostics and other heretical or misguided Christians, that matter is essentially evil; whereas at the creation, God declared it good, and when organized into the body of a Christian it is a temple of the Holy Ghost, and as a body prepared in the womb of the Virgin Mary it is the inseparable flesh-tabernacle of our God himself, in the person of Christ.*

It may be fairly questioned whether all views of the Lord's Supper, other than the Lutheran, because they fail to accord the proper place to the "creature" as the vehicle of Christ's self-revelation, and of his self-communication ("Deifer panis"), do not often lead Christians to practically regard the whole eucharistic service as "mere ideas, phantasms, baseless fabrics of a vision,"

*The ministry of Christ was to the whole man, body, soul and spirit. He thought enough of the body to heal it of every sort of infirmity that it knew in his day. The Church in our day, in her deaconess work and otherwise is getting back to the methods of her Lord. Surely Christ's idea of the human body was not that of the pagan, and the heretic, and the ascetic,—that being made of matter it was necessarily evil and the chief seat of man's sin. A sentiment like that in the lines, "Here in the body pent, Absent from him I roam," is, of course, true in a certain aspect, while in another it is based upon a mistaken exegesis.

instead of accepting it as a communication of Christ himself, in his full and proper person as the God-man.

Such a Christology makes it easier to reach some real apprehension of how God can impart himself to creatures made up, as men are, of material body and of spirit. Having deigned to make nature witness to his existence, power and divinity, he makes it also the vehicle of his special, gracious communication of himself to his own in the Eucharist.

If it be questioned whether the accepted principles of exegesis, representing the scientific culmination of the last 367 years of theological study are not likely to invalidate, or at least to seriously modify, the eucharistic doctrine of the Augustana, it may be answered that there are no such signs to-day. There are, however, most significant movements to the contrary.*

The exegesis of Luther and Melanchthon rested upon sound principles that can safely undergo but little modification, principles that were free from early and medieval fancies; free also from a crass literalism that produced transubstantiation, equally free also from a rationalism that might rob the Bible of its miracles and mysteries, and did rob the Eucharist of the essential presence of the Lord who redeemed us, and who in it, by gracious will and omnipotent word, communicates himself to his own, that the indwelling God may be the soul's food of immortality.

Luther—Melanchthon;—miner's son—armorer's son;—miner and fashioner of the hidden but precious metal of divine truth: Providential men, as few have been: by native endowment; by intellectual and spiritual culture; by adequate mastery of relevant preceding philosophical and religious thought; by the true understanding of all relevant passages of God's word, through the use of correct exegetical methods: the results of their la-

*Lias in his Nicene Creed, of recent date, says, that one important phase of the great theological movements in England during this century is the return to richer views of the sacramental presence. He holds that there has been developed a particular theory of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, which in its distinctive features, as set forth by him, has marked affinities with the Lutheran doctrine of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. He errs with common English insularity, in thinking his compatriots have developed something new.

bors as embodied in their matured doctrine of the Lord's Supper, were not only the high water-mark of Christian theology in 1530, but remain unshaken to this day.

With John the Constant, the noble Confessor at Augsburg, we may well say: Verbum Dei manet eternum.

And so may we well believe that evermore, in the Church there will abide enough of wise conservatism to refuse to deplete the words of Christ of their rich content at the bidding of "Dame Reason," and to refuse with equal positiveness to accept a magical transmutation at the bidding of a hierarchy, haughty in wealth and power secured by gains from the victims of her untruths. To do that is to abide in the truth as confessed by our Fathers at Augsburg.

ARTICLE III.

LUTHER'S ATTITUDE AT THE MARBURG COLLOQUY.

By John J. Young, D. D.

The unflinching firmness manifested by Luther at Worms won for him universal admiration. Historians vie with each other in extolling him for his noble and heroic stand. That stand was an epoch, not only in Luther's life, but also in the world's history. Luther's "no" at worms enabled the "churches and ministers, princes and people" to say "no," at the Diet of Spires. His attitude at the Marburg Colloquy has been viewed in a somewhat different light. Whilst at Marburg Luther stood as firmly and upon the same foundation as at Worms, his stand has, nevertheless, been severely criticised, especially by Zwingli's friends and sympathizers. According to the views expressed by these critics there would surely have been a union had Luther not been so obstinate. If, however, according to these views a union would have proven a panacea for the troubles then existing, why did not Zwingli yield to Luther, instead of expecting Luther to yield to him? Was Luther more obliged to accede to Zwingli's view on the Lord's Supper than Zwingli was to Luther's? And since, according to Luther's observation,

Zwingli did not attach much importance to his own doctrines, it would have been no difficult task for him to yield and thus, not only bring about the much desired union, but also receive the credit and honor for the same. It looks, however, as if the union sought by Zwingli was not so much a union with Luther as a union of Luther with him; or a union achieved by a victory over Luther.

Thus it is generally with those who are so anxious for a union. They do not want to unite with others as much as they want others to unite with them. Hence, when they fail, they have often much to say about the intolerance and obstinacy of those who would not accede to their wishes. Among the doctrines for which Luther stood so firmly at Worms, we find that of the Lord's Supper. He is universally praised for his unflinching firmness at Worms in behalf of his doctrines, including the Lord's Supper; but when at Marburg he defends the same doctrine with equal firmness and the same word of God, he is accused of uncharitable obstinacy. Why this difference? Whilst Luther acted consistently on both occasions, those who praise his firm stand at Worms and find fault with his equally firm stand at Marburg, act very inconsistently. This inconsistency shows that they have a different spirit.

We believe that Luther's firm faith in God's word; his opposition to rebellion against the higher powers; and the spirit and tactics of the Swiss throw much light upon his attitude at Marburg.

Luther's firm faith in God's word had, beyond doubt, much to do with his unyielding position at the Colloquy. That he laid not only great stress upon the word of God but was also bound to it, is evident from the fact that he wrote with a piece of chalk the following words upon the velvet cloth that covered the table before him: "*Hoc est corpus meum.*" This he did to have his Saviour's declaration continually before him; to have his faith strengthened thereby, and to be a "sign to his adversaries." All the arguments and flank movements of his opponents could not drive him from the same. He would always fall

back upon his Master's words and reply, Christ has said, "This is my body." From this stronghold he would hurl back "reason, common sense, carnal arguments and mathematical proofs." God, he would reply, is above mathematics; we have his Word and "we must adore and perform it." His opponents labored manfully to convince him that Christ's words, "The flesh profiteth nothing," were the same as, "My flesh" or, "The flesh of the Son of Man." Luther held that there was a great difference between these expressions. Whilst the words, "The flesh" referred to common flesh; the words, "My flesh" referred to the flesh of the Son of God. When they charged his view as unintelligible he replied, "To seek to understand it is to fall away from faith." He firmly believed that according to the descriptions of the Lord's Supper, as given by Matthew, Mark, Luke and St. Paul, the communicant received not only real bread and real wine, but also the real body and real blood of Christ. This he conscientiously believed to be the teaching of God's word on this important subject. Hence he was bound to consider the other doctrine as erroneous, and those who maintained it as errorists.

LUTHER'S OPPOSITION TO REBELLION AGAINST THE HIGHER POWERS had, no doubt, also something to do with his firm stand at Marburg. Even those who are but partially acquainted with Luther's writings know that he was continually opposed to the use of arms; that he was no revolutionist. He had no use for arms, neither did he put his trust in them. He trusted in God and his word, instead of arms and armies. On this point he was just as firm as on the Lord's Supper. To him the government was a divine institution, and the Emporer the chief ruler of Germany. He no more favored the opposition of the constituted authority with violence, than the apostle did. "It is unbelief," said he, "which does not trust God to think that he does not know how to protect us without our genius or power."

There was a general belief at that time, that a union of the Evangelicals was absolutely necessary to maintain the protest at Spires, and to carry the Reformation to success. Hence, before leaving Spires, the Elector of Saxony and Landgrave Philip of

Hesse united with Strassburg, Ulm and Nuremburg in a defensive alliance. The Landgrave afterwards formed an agreement with Zurich, and Zwingli requested Francis I, of France, to enter the alliance. In these proceedings the doctrinal differences between Luther and Zwingli were entirely overlooked. Luther opposed the whole movement. His keen eye discovered battles and war behind the proposed Christian Confederacy. Hence he had no faith in it whatever. Philip at once began to realize that the success of the proposed confederation depended after all, upon the agreement of the theologians. To bring about such an agreement a meeting was absolutely necessary. Zwingli was heartily in favor of such a meeting. In fact he had been working and waiting for such an opportunity for some time. When the council of Zurich positively refused to grant him permission to attend the Colloquy, he went without it, because he felt that "the welfare of all Christendom summoned him to Marburg." Luther had no such feelings, neither was he anxious to go. In fact he would have rejoiced if the Elector had been willing for him to stay at home. He had no faith in the entire movement. He was no politician and desired to have as little as possible to do with political issues. God's word was of greater importance to him, as a defensive power, than the armies about to be united. In fact, no one could make him believe that "the salvation of the Christian republic" depended upon the issues of that meeting. He felt it his conscientious duty to do all in his power to prevent war, and teach the people to trust in the sword of the Spirit instead of carnal weapons. In this respect Luther was far ahead of his age. Feeling assured that the object of the conference was rather to fall back upon and take hold of the sword of the flesh than the sword of the Spirit, he was compelled to look with suspicion upon the entire movement.

THE SPIRIT AND TACTICS OF THE SWISS have thus far received little attention in the descriptions and discussions of the Marburg Colloquy. It is generally taken for granted that the Swiss were free from uncharitableness, intolerance, ill-temper, obstinacy and guile. Very little is said, at least, about these characteristics as far as Luther's opponents are concerned. May it

not be that the Swiss were, after all, not quite so charitable, tolerant, sweet-tempered, yielding and guileless as they are generally supposed to have been; and that their spirit and tactics, before and during the Colloquy, may have had much to do with Luther's attitude, manner of argument and mode of defence. Take, for instance, the very popular history of the Reformation, written by D'Aubigne, read the chapter on the Marburg Colloquy and you will find some very peculiar and striking representations there. Whilst we have no reason to pronounce them misrepresentations we must, nevertheless, confess that they imply some facts not given by the historian. Of course we are not in a position to say why these implied facts have not been made known to the reader.

Take, for instance, Zwingli's eagerness for the Colloquy and Luther's indifference, if not opposition to it. There is something very striking about this. Why was Zwingli so anxious, even against the will of the Council of Zurich, to go not only to Marburg but even "to the end of the world," if need be, in order to meet and dispute with Luther? Whilst Luther had little inclination to attend the proposed Conference and much less faith in its results; Zwingli, on the contrary, felt that the welfare of Christendom summoned him to Marburg and that the results were as good as settled. Is not this somewhat strange?

Again, we are told, that the divinity of Christ, original sin, baptism, the word of God, etc., were all looked upon by Zwingli as secondary matters. In regard to these he dropped his unchurchly views and declared himself in harmony with the Œcumenical Councils. After the interview between Zwingli and Melanchthon had taken place, the latter reported, "Our adversaries have given away on all these points." But when it came to the article of the Lord's Supper there was no giving away there. Whilst to the Wittenbergers the divinity of Christ, original sin, baptism, the Word of God, etc., were so important that they were unwilling to take up the Lord's Supper till these were settled; they were to the Swiss but secondary to the Lord's Supper. Why were the Swiss so exceedingly anxious to cross

swords with the Wittenbergers on this subject? Is this not rather peculiar?

Then, there is Luther's reception of Bucer. Whilst he "conversed affectionately with Œcolampadius in the castle court" his reception of Bucer was everything but affectionate. Smilingly, we are told, he made a sign with his hand and said, "As for you, you are a good-for-nothing fellow and a knave." Did Luther receive him thus because he had somewhat changed his mind and had gone over to Zwingli, or was there some other cause for using such language? Does it not look as though there must have been some graver cause than mere change of mind? May it not be that Bucer in his conciliatory efforts, for which he was especially known, acted the knave and thus brought upon himself Luther's indignation? To say the least, there is something very striking about this reception.

Again, we are told that during the Colloquy Zwingli bursted into tears. The last time he did so he was approaching Luther with outstreched arms. Why these tears? Did he love union so dearly that he wept because of it? If so, why did he not do what he advised and urged Luther to do? Or did he weep because he hoped to bring about with deep emotions and silent tears what he could not accomplish with strong arguments and well chosen words? We cannot tell. But we do know that Luther did not weep because he could not convince Zwingli; neither did the latter's tears move the former to accept his opponent's view.

The following occurrence is also very striking. We are told that when Luther rejected the offered hand of his weeping opponent he made use of the following words, "You have a different spirit from ours." These words are said to have had a very peculiar and plainly perceptible effect upon them. "They communicated to the Swiss, as it were, an electrical shock. Their hearts sank each time Luther repeated them, and he did so frequently." It is rather strange that these words should have such an effect upon the Swiss; and that, notwithstanding this peculiar and painful effect, Luther should utter them frequently. Whilst Zwingli's words, deep emotions and silent tears had no

effect upon Luther at all; the latter's words, "You have a different spirit from ours," cut the former to the very quick each time the latter felt like using them. Is not this remarkable! How can this effect be accounted for and why did Luther, being aware of the effect, nevertheless, repeat them frequently?

That there is something mysterious about these interesting statements is evident. And it is just as evident that they imply facts which for some reason are not given. Might not these implied facts unravel the mystery and explain Luther's attitude at the Colloquy in the true light? But where can we get the implied facts? Recent investigations have done much in this direction. Their results enable us to conclude, that the spirit and tactics of the Swiss have more to do with Luther's attitude at Marburg than his stubbornness, want of charity, or inability to make a respectable defence of his doctrine. These researches have brought forth facts which explain the striking statements and set forth Luther in a different light altogether.

An article on "*Reformierte Taktik im Sakramentsstreit der Reformationszeit*," by Prof. Dr. W. Walther, of Rostock, published in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, vol. vii, brings out some very interesting and instructive facts on this important subject. The sources whence he obtained these facts, are largely found in Zwingli's works of the Schuler and Schulthess edition. From the results of the researches of this able scholar, we learn that the tactics of the Swiss theologians were somewhat different from those of the Wittenbergers. Their eagerness, long and studious preparation for a conflict with the Wittenbergers on the subject of the Lord's Supper, their peculiar procedure to secure the same, and their manner of conducting it, convinced Luther that openness and veracity were not the only weapons used by his opponents. Even the gentle, peace-loving and charitable Melanchthon was thereby led to doubt Zwingli's sincerity and his religious experience.

Years before the Colloquy took place, Zwingli felt a desire to assail and wipe out that "remnant of papistical leaven," as he described Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper. But it was thought best not to bring "this very weighty matter" before the

public until he had discussed the same in a quiet way with pious and learned men in order that it might have many able defenders, when the time for public action came. About five hundred copies of a feigned letter (fingierten Brief) were sent to confidential persons, with strict instructions to show the same only to persons thoroughly grounded in the faith, and not to allow the same to be published. The letter was addressed to one of Luther's followers and so circulated that not even the recipients were aware that they were the only ones who knew of it. Hence they looked upon the silence of Luther and his friends as an evidence of their agreement with Zwingli. The movement proved a success. In March, 1525, he published the questionable letter openly. Henceforth he assailed Luther's doctrine publicly. Luther kept silent. Œcolampadius now joins Zwingli. But their combined efforts failed to draw out Luther. This silence induced them to believe that success was crowning their efforts, and that before long the "remnant of papistical leaven" would be wiped out. Still, they felt that as long as Luther did not declare himself converted, or was with his counter-arguments swept from the field, the victory could not be considered as complete. Though Zwingli's friends urged him to assail Luther, still there was no opportunity for a decisive attack, since Luther refused to come out of his camp. As soon as it was discovered that violence accomplished nothing Zwingli is counseled to aim at the victory in a gentle and loving way. Luther, however, placed no confidence in this pretentious show, but looked upon it with suspicion. In February, 1526, Zwingli sent forth his first treatise on the Lord's Supper in the German language under the title: "*Eine Klare Unterichtung vom Abendmahl.*" On the title page he stated that up to this time he had not written upon the subject in German, but felt himself compelled to do so "for the sake of the laity, lest they might be deceived through some one's subtlety." Even this treatise failed to bring about the desired effect. Feeling assured that the much coveted victory could not be secured on the line thus far pursued, a man, by the name of *Leo Jud*, now comes forth to accomplish what Zwingli had failed to do. Whilst this man moved on a somewhat dif-

ferent line, the tactics were, nevertheless, the same; believing, very likely, that everything was lawful in an ecclesiastical warfare as well as in a war between nations. In April, 1526, Jud published a book in Zurich under the title: "*Des hochgelehrten Erasmi von Roterdam und Dr. Luther's Meinungen vom Nachtmal unsers Herrn Jesu Christi:*" (Views of the very learned Erasmus of Roterdam and Dr. Luther concerning the Supper of our Lord Jesus Christ.") In this book much solicitude was expressed because these two great men did not agree "with others" on the subject of the Lord's Supper. The writer now intimates that Luther may have been misrepresented through books written by others in his name, since, according to his other books, he does not accept the presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament. Jud had a peculiar way of arriving at this conclusion. It is as follows: Since Luther does not consider the mass a sacrifice, therefore, "flesh and blood cannot be there;" and since he calls the Supper a sacrament, consequently, he does not consider it flesh and blood, since a sacrament is only a sign of holy things and not the thing itself. Although in other places he (Luther) speaks of partaking of the body and blood in the Supper, these statements must, according to the other clear expressions, be understood as a spiritual participation through faith! Jud claimed, that as long as Erasmus and Luther did not express themselves publicly, that long could the world not come to peace on this important subject. He, therefore, requested them for "God's sake" to keep silent no longer. The well-planned strategical movement could not induce Luther, however, to come forth and accept the offered challenge. He looked upon the whole treatise as a blind to cover its misrepresentations.

Is it any wonder that Luther had no inclination for a colloquy with persons who used such polemics; that he was not only averse to such a meeting, but doubted its results? What could be expected from a meeting with such persons? Nothing. We need go no further, since the facts referred to sufficiently explain Zwingli's great anxiety for the proposed Colloquy; why he was so eager to meet and dispute with Luther on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and why he looked upon the outcome as set-

tled. He, very likely, thought that as soon as the little Saxon monk stood before the august presence of the great Swiss theologian the former would tremble in his boots, throw down his sword and surrender unconditionally; and that the latter, after the completion of the proposed political combination, could return to his Alpine home as victor over him, whom even the united powers of the Pope and Emperor failed to vanquish.

There appeared now a man upon the field of battle by the name of *Bucer.* This is the person whom Luther received at Marburg with the words, "As for you, you are a good-for-nothing fellow and a knave." Bucer took no small part in the preliminary arrangements for the wiping out of that "remnant of papistical leaven." Having obtained permission from Bugenhagen to translate his Latin Commentary on the Psalms into German—with authority to make such changes as he considered necessary to produce a popular instead of a literal translation; and with the request, that Luther's German translation was to be taken as the basis, both of the translation and the changes—he went to work and so changed Bugenhagen's teaching on the Lord's Supper that it was in perfect harmony with that of Zwingli. In doing so he endeavored to leave the impression that Bugenhagen and the other Wittenbergers had, through Zwingli's doctrine, come to a knowledge of their former errors. When Luther afterwards accused Bucer of these misrepresentations he endeavered to justify himself by saying, Bugenhagen had given him the liberty to make necessary changes. Bucer found a public defender in Zwingli, who endeavored to show that love induced him to do what he did. In fact his defence implied that both Jud and Bucer had rendered the Wittenbergers a great service in making it possible for them thus quietly to acquiesce, save themselves from the disgrace of a public renunciation and leave the people under the impression that they had always been favorably inclined to ward Zwinglianism! This was, however, not the only work Bucer did of this nature. In order to secure a market for Luther's sermons, in other countries, Herwagen, a publisher of Hagenau, employed Bucer to translate

the same into Latin. In this translation he not only did what he had done before, but even assailed Luther's doctrine, justifying his action by saying: "No sensible man, not even Luther himself, would maintain that he (Luther) clearly apprehended every verse in the right sense, and had never made a mistake." In doing this he not only heaped the greatest insult upon Luther, the living author of the sermons he was translating, but also discouraged faith in Luther's writings. No wonder Bucer wrote to Zwingli, "The indignation of the Wittenbergers rests now no less upon me than upon you." But he consoled himself with the thought, that he had done all this to maintain the honor of God against the flesh, the devil and the arrogance of the Wittenbergers. Is it any wonder that Luther said to Bucer at Marburg, "As for you, you are a good-for-nothing fellow and a knave?" Surely not. If any man ever acted the knave Bucer did so in translating Bugenhagen's Psalms and Luther's sermons. In fact it is somewhat surprising that Luther would have anything to do with a man, who had treated him, his friend, and his doctrine, thus.

The mischievous work of Bucer, in the translation of some of Luther's sermons into Latin, has caused much confusion and ill-feeling, many misrepresentations and divisions in the Church. Persons, not aware of these facts, can through such misrepresentations easily be led astray. If a person, for instance, unacquainted with the tactics referred to, should come across one of Luther's sermons, in which Zwingli's view had been substituted for Luther's, he would at once come to the conclusion, that what is at present taught as the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper is, after all, not Luther's doctrine; since, according to the sermon just read, Luther did not teach the real presence of the body and blood of Christ. Yet Bucer is not the only man who has acted the part of "a good-for-nothing fellow and a knave" in this direction. In 1841, there was published a Life of Luther by John Fred. Wm. Tischler, and printed by Solomon S. Wiles, (of Boston, if I mistake not) which contains a selection from the most celebrated sermons of Luther, translated from the German. Among this selection is sermon 8 on John 6 : 44–51, in which

Zwingli's teaching on the Lord's Supper has been substituted for Luther's. Since this sermon was not in existence when Bucer corrupted Luther's sermons, either the author himself or some one who translated Luther's celebrated sermons for him, must be guilty of the deed. For all we know, there may be some other books containing such misleading sermons. Why some of Zwingli's friends have lowered themselves to such misrepresentations and deceptions, and why they are so anxious to represent Luther as in harmony with the Swiss Reformer on the subject of the Lord's Supper, we know not; but we do know, that honest followers of Christ, be they found in the Lutheran or Reformed Churches, look with disapprobation and sad hearts upon such work and workers. No true servant of the Lord in any church wants to be led astray by such misrepresentations, and become the unconscious tool, either in the pulpit or press, of literary counterfeiters. These facts should not only put Lutherans, but also all honest and truth loving persons on their guard; and since we now have a reliable English translation of Luther's doctrines, no one need allow himself henceforth to be taken in by such false representations and become the unconscious tool of "a good-for-nothing fellow and a knave."

As to the words, "*You have a different spirit from ours,*" Dr. Walther has plainly shown, in the article from which these facts are drawn, that the sentiment contained therein is of Zwinglian and not of Lutheran origin. Notwithstanding the fact that Luther has been blamed and held responsible for the harsh judgment contained therein, the same was nevertheless pronounced against the Wittenbergers four years before the Marburg Colloquy. When the questionable tactics, already referred to, failed to draw out Luther, Zwingli declared in April, 1525, that the Lutheran opponents of his doctrine were "von einem andern Geiste geführt," meaning thereby, that their holding fast to the body and blood, through Luther's influence, was a hypocrisy. This would of course imply that the advocates of Luther's doctrine were hypocrites. If Luther used the words at Marburg in "their own, true, native, original and only sense"—as used by the author himself—we need not be surprised that they "communicated

to the Swiss, as it were, an electrical shock," and that "their hearts sank each time Luther repeated them." Yea, if he used them thus, they also show us how the Saxon monk looked upon the deep emotions, silent tears and outstretched hand of the Swiss theologian.

The results of Dr. Walther's researches have, at last, unraveled the mystery of the interesting and striking statements concerning the Marburg Colloquy. The facts, necessary for a proper understanding of Luther's attitude at the Colloquy, are now in our possession. They reveal unto us, on the one hand, the unfair treatment Luther has been subjected to; and, on the other, the source of so much confusion and strife concerning Luther's teachings about the Lord's Supper. Looking at these historical facts, largely gathered from Zwingli's own works, Luther's attitude at Marburg surprises us no longer; and apologies are henceforth out of place, as far as the Wittenbergers are concerned. The question confronting us now is no longer: Why did Luther act thus? but: How could Luther act otherwise without playing the part of a hypocrite? He went as far as he conscientiously could go; and the stand his conscience compelled him to take was no less noble than the one he took before the Emperor. Under the circumstances he could no more "do otherwise" at Marburg than at Worms.

ARTICLE IV.

THE FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINES.

By Rev. L. S. Keyser, A. M.

To our mind there is more or less confusion of thought in our Church as to the precise meaning of the term "fundamental" in the General Synod's form of confessional subscription. That formula states that the Augsburg Confession is "a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine word." It would seem that so plain and simple a statement could not have been misunderstood, and that differences of opinion as to its meaning never could have arisen; and yet, sad to say, there are persons who, on the one hand, refine away its plain meaning, and others who, on the other hand, make it a reason for rejecting some of the distinctive doctrines exhibited in the Augustana.

The argument of the first class is that every doctrine set forth in the Augsburg Confession is "fundamental to something"—some doctrines being fundamental to salvation, others to the Christian system, and others to the Lutheran system of doctrine. It is difficult to believe that the fathers, when they framed this form of subscription, had all those refinements in mind; for surely if they had thought of anything so labored and articulated, they would have made a clear and full attempt to define the term "fundamental." Is it not more reasonable to believe that they thought the meaning of the term so evident that it could not be misunderstood? If the word "fundamental" can be so bandied about as to convey three or four different meanings, then indeed it is a most unfortunate word to use in a church's confessional subscription, which, above all other formulas, ought to be clear and definite.

As to the second class of writers, who contend that the word "fundamental" gives them liberty to reject some of the doctrines of the Augustana, and thus practically makes them free lances in matters of doctrine, we deem them as far astray as those who

refine upon the meaning of the word. Their first error is that they confuse "the fundamental doctrines of God's word" with "a correct exhibition." Note carefully the precise phrasing of our form of subscription: We accept "the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines *of the divine word.*" It is not said that the exhibition is fundamental, but that the doctrines of the divine word are fundamental and that the confession is a correct exhibition of them. That is an important distinction. The Helvetic and Westminster confessions set forth the same doctrines, but not in the same way. Their exhibition of the doctrine of Christ's person is not precisely the same as the exhibition of that doctrine found in the Augsburg Confession. The Reformed and the Calvinist have their peculiar and distinctive view of certain doctrines, and that view makes them what they are in the theological world; the Lutheran has another view of certain doctrines, namely, the conception given in the Augustana, and that differentiates him as a Lutheran. If a theologian believes that Christ in his human nature is only at God's right hand in the remote heavens and cannot be anywhere else, and that therefore the believer must be elevated in thought to that place in order to have communion with the Lord, then that theologian is a Calvinist and not a Lutheran in respect to the doctrine of the person of Christ; but he who believes that Christ's glorified humanity is ubiquitous, and that the natures of our Lord cannot be separated, but that he, in the totality of his being, is not only at God's right hand, but also present with the believer, is a Lutheran in respect to that doctrine. Thus we see that it is the "exhibition" of the doctrine and not the doctrine itself that determines its Lutheranism or its Calvinism, as the case may be.

To illustrate still further, we have known General Synod men to point to the tenth artrcle of the Augustana, the one relating to the Eucharist, and declare, "That is not fundamental, and therefore we need not believe it in order to be General Synod Lutherans." Note the confusion of thought. The General Synod does not say that the tenth article is a fundamental doctrine, but it does say that it is "a correct exhibition" of a funda-

mental doctrine. Surely all persons will admit that the Lord's Supper is one of the fundamental doctrines of God's word—that is, an integral part of the Biblical system. If that is true, then the tenth article of the Augustana must be regarded by the General Synod as *a correct exhibition* of that doctrine.

Even at risk of repetition let us put the argument in the form of a syllogism: The General Synod declares the Augsburg Confession to be "a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine word;" the Lord's Supper is a fundamental doctrine of the divine word; therefore, the General Synod declares the Augsburg Confession to be "a correct exhibition" of that doctrine.

The same process of reasoning would hold good in regard to any other Scriptural doctrine exhibited in the confession.

Another error committed by those who wish to take advantage of the term "fundamental," is that they almost invariably use it in the sense of fundamental to *salvation.* Now, we are persuaded that the fathers never meant to employ it in that sweeping sense. The fact is, it would be extremely difficult, not to say hazardous, for any man or any set of men to say what is absolutely essential to salvation. It is proper to define truth as clearly, definitely and even nicely as possible, but it is unbecoming for fallible beings to pronounce verdict *ex cathedra* as to the eternal destiny of their fellow-creatures. The Apostle Paul seems to teach that even the heathen who live according to their best light are a law unto themselves. A man's salvation may not depend upon the clearness of his intellectual conceptions or even of his spiritual apprehension of many doctrines. And yet that is no reason why we should not endeavor to gain as large and accurate views of Christian truth as possible. A man might be a Christian and finally get to heaven even if he held many errors, providing he was honest; and yet he would be a much better Christian, and would doubtless have a more abundant salvation, if he did not cling to those errors. The Lutheran feels that the Zwinglian is in error in his conception of the person of Christ and the Lord's Supper, and he feels, too, that the error is a grave one; but he does not mean thereby to close the gates

of heaven against his opponent. Because you point out a fellow-Christian's errors, you do not mean to consign him to everlasting flames. Indeed, we are not to be judges in such matters, for "we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ."

For these reasons we do not believe that our fathers of 1868, who were liberal-minded men, meant to declare that a certain set of doctrines were absolutely fundamental to salvation; for that would have been dogmatic and presumptuous. And those contestants to-day who use the word "fundamental" in that sense are surely assuming a very serious responsibility when they venture to say which particular doctrines are essential to salvation and which are not. Take, for instance, the first article of the Augsburg Confession, defining the doctrine of the Trinity. Perhaps all General Synod ministers would agree that this is a correct exhibition of a fundamental doctrine of God's word; and yet who would venture to assert that no person could be saved unless he grasped the profound doctrine there inculcated? There are many honest persons in the Roman Catholic Church who have no clear conception of the doctrine of justification by faith, and yet no modest theologian would venture to pronounce sentence of eternal condemnation upon them.

In what sense, then, did our fathers in 1868 use the word "fundamental?" Surely in the simplest and most obvious sense. What is the meaning of the word "fundamental?" It means, *pertaining to the foundation.* The fathers meant to say that the Augustana is a correct exhibition of the *chief* doctrines of God's word, those that belong to the foundation; as much as to say: "There are other doctrines of the divine word not here exhibited, but these are the principal ones, the most important ones, the *fundamental* ones."

Now, let us see whether this view will not clear up many of our difficulties. The Scriptural doctrines exhibited in the Augsburg Confession all pertain to the foundation of the Christian system, but that is not tantamount to saying that they are all of equal importance. Take the foundation stones of a building as an illustration. You might remove one of them, and yet the building might stand, although it would be sadly marred. Some

of the stones, however, might be so large and important and so strategically located that their removal would cause the building to crash to the ground. So it is with the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession. You may reject some of them and yet not destroy the Christian system, however much you would mar and disfigure it. But if others were removed, like the doctrine of Christ in Article III, the very corner-stone of the Christian system would be taken away, and the superstructure would topple to the earth.

Now, here is a distinction that every person should be able to see. So far as confessions are concerned, some of these foundation doctrines are peculiar to Christianity, such as the doctrines of the Triune God and of Christ; others are peculiar to Protestant Christianity, such as the doctrines of justification, of the Church, and of the ministry; others are peculiar to the Lutheran view of the Biblical system of truth, such as the doctrines of the ubiquity of Christ's human nature, of the sacraments as means of grace, and of the "real presence" in the Eucharist. As Lutherans we believe that the exhibition made by the Augustana is correct, and this the General Synod states in her formula of credal subscription in the most positive and explicit language.

This brings us face to face with a crucial question that needs elucidation: Can a minister be a true General Synod Lutheran and still discard some of the *doctrines* set forth in the Augsburg Confession? We think not. Why? Simply because the General Synod declares that the Augustana is "a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine word," and he who says it is not a correct exhibition of certain doctrines, asserts the very contrary of the General Synod's declaration. But does not the word *fundamental* afford a loophole for the escape of those who do not accept certain well-known distinctively Lutheran doctrines? It does not, because if you will carefully examine the phraseology of our confessional subscription, you will see that it does not mean to say that some doctrines are fundamental and others non-fundamental, but that *all* are fundamen-

tal and that the Augustana is a correct exhibition of them. The idea is that these are the fundamental doctrines, while other doctrines of God's word not exhibited in the confession do not belong to the foundation of the Christian system.

A little knowledge of General Synod doctrinal history will make this clear. Before 1868 the word "substantially" was found in our formula of confessional subscription. We then said that the Augustana was only a *substantially* correct exhibition of the doctrines of God's word. Why was the word "substantially" expunged? Because it made our credal subscription too indefinite; it made every man a free lance, and left us practically without a creed. Whenever a minister wanted to reject an article or a part of an article, he could not be called to account, the word "substantially" always affording him a place of refuge. It was too general and too vague a term. But if the word "fundamental" offers the same easy mode of escape and is equally ambiguous, what is the difference between the old form of subscription and the new? And yet we know full well that the new form was substituted for the very purpose of putting the General Synod on a firmer and less equivocal Lutheran basis, as Dr. Richard has shown in more than one keenly logical article. Would the fathers have made a change that they knew would defeat their own purposes?

Indeed, if the word "fundamental" binds pastors and synods to only a part of the Augsburg Confession, and gives them free license to reject certain articles *in toto*, then the old word "substantially" would be preferable; for then it could at least be said that every article was *substantially* correct; whereas the modern liberalistic interpreters of the word "fundamental" really feel justified in repudiating several articles in their entirety. More than that, if the General Synod means to say that some articles of the confession are fundamental and others non-fundamental, then we practically have no creed; for the General Synod does not define those that are fundamental, but leaves every man to accept or reject *ad libitum*, and if you call him to account, he will simply assert: "That article is not fundamental!" Who is to be the judge? But the General Synod, we are thankful to say,

is not founded on a confessional sandbank like that. She knows herself as both soundly evangelical and soundly Lutheran; and while she does not excommunicate men who reject some of the distinctively Lutheran doctrines, she cognizes their un-Lutheran character; and protests that they do not correctly represent her.

We might paraprhase her confessional position in this way: The doctrine of God is a fundamental doctrine of God's word, and Art. I. is a correct exhibition of it. The doctrine of original sin is fundamental, and Art. II. is a correct exhibition of it. The doctrine of the person of Christ is fundamental, and Art. III. correctly exhibits it. The doctrine of justification by faith is fundamental, and is correctly exhibited in Art. IV. The doctrine of the Lord's Supper is fundamental, and Art. X. is a correct exhibition of it; and so on through all the doctrinal articles.

It is painful to note that a few men are constantly taking advantage of the word "fundamental" as a sufficient pretext for rejecting some articles of the Augustana. While they do not definitely and candidly say so, they cannot disguise the fact that there are some things in the confession that are an offense to them. In the interest of clear, definite and positive thinking we must ask them to tell us without equivocation just which articles of the confession are non-fundamental; to name the ones they cannot accept and give the reasons for their repudiation. All of us are in search of light, and if there are serious errors in the Augustana, the Church ought to know it. Surely nothing can be gained by covering up important truth. Those who feel certain that the creed is so sadly astray on certain doctrines owe it to the Church to come out with a clear and convincing exposition of its supposed errors. It is wrong to stir up agitation on other issues, while this is the real gravamen of all our difficulties.

There are writers in the Church who decry creeds, and tell us that we can accept them only as far as they are in accord with God's word. Certainly! And that is precisely the reason some of us accept the Augustana—we think it "a correct exhibition" of the foundation doctrines of God's word. But there seems to be an intimation in the manner of address employed by these

writers that there are some things in the confession that fall foul of the Holy Scriptures. Then why not be thorough and definite and tell the Church just what those errors are? We do not believe that the General Synod desires to cling to a creed that contains serious errors; but if she is asked to give up her beloved and venerated confession, its errors must first be clearly cited and proved.

Here are some plain, matter-of-fact questions for those who indulge in intangible hints about errors in the confession: Do you really accept the Augustana, or do you not? If you reject parts of it, which parts do you discard? If some articles are non-fundamental, which do you regard as such? Until our theological writers get down to clear thinking and writing, it will be impossible to come to an understanding or give relief to our present strained relations. Lack of candor will be more fruitful of harm than anything else, while full and frank discussion might speedily bring about an amicable adjustment of affairs. So far as we can analyze the situation, it is as follows: There is one party in the Church which honestly accepts the Augsburg Confession, believing it to be a correct exhibition of every doctrine set forth; and they accept it, not so much because it is Lutheran as because they believe it to be throughout in harmony with God's word. This certainly is a clear, definite and unmistakable position. There is another party which is opposed to the first party and which seems to be especially sensitive on the question of an unqualified subscription to the confession. Now, what is the precise doctrinal position of this last-named party? So far as we can learn from their more or less vague hints, they do not accept all the articles of the confession, and are opposed to any one who does; but somehow they studiously refrain from telling the Church just which articles they accept and which they reject.

It is evident that this party looks askance at certain articles of the confession, and imputes certain serious errors to that document. But does the confession really teach the errors attributed to it by these critics? Perhaps more thorough investigation would prove that it does not. We know a number of min-

isters and theologians in the General Synod who once thought that the confession taught some five or six very grave errors, such as priestly absolution and a materialistic presence of Christ in the Holy Supper; but after more thorough research, they have found that they had themselves been in error; the confession did not, after all, inculcate those unevangelical doctrines. Might not honest research disabuse the minds of others? The framers of the Definite Platform accused the Augustana of teaching five or six distinct errors; but the York Resolutions were an effective answer to those charges, expressly denying that the Augustana taught the errors specified. Our fathers of 1864 made the following most solemn declaration: "And while we would, with our whole heart, reject any part of any confession which taught doctrines in conflict with this, our testimony; nevertheless, *before God and his Church*, we declare that in our judgment the Augsburg Confession, properly interpreted, is in perfect consistence with this our testimony and with the Holy Scriptures as regards the errors specified." Nothing could be clearer than that the General Synod of 1864 meant to protest that the Augustana was throughout entirely evangelical and did not contain any of the errors charged against it. For this reason they inserted the explanatory phrase, "properly interpreted," for they knew that some persons of their day had misinterpreted the confession, and hence had erroneously changed it with Romish or semi-Romish teaching.

Would it not be a happy day if all who now regard the confession with suspicion could be convinced, through more thorough investigation, that the Augustana is, after all, entirely in accord with the Holy Scriptures, and thus close the whole agitated controversy? Then all of us who compose the General Synod would stand on the same doctrinal platform, and the era of internecine strife would be past.

To give some concrete examples: There are men who seem to think that the tenth article teaches a gross or materialistic presence of Christ's body and blood in the elements of the Lord's Supper, and that the eating and drinking are little less than Capernaitish eating and drinking; but when we examine

the doctrine more thoroughly, we find that the Reformers always spoke of Christ's presence as a heavenly, supernatural presence and the eating and drinking as a spiritual participation or communion. Many have objected to the eleventh article, but more extensive research proves that the Reformers merely meant by private confession the individualizing of the Gospel, and while we may not observe the precise *forms* that they recommend, all of us believe heartily in the doctrine of the article—namely, that troubled conscious should often be consoled by the pastor in a private or individualized way, and the penitent believer should receive the private message just as gladly and confidingly as if the declaration of God's pardoning grace came from the pulpit. Objection has been raised that the Augustana retained the Romish Mass; but more careful reading proves the very opposite,—that the confession rejected the *Romish* Mass and everything distinctive of it, and merely retained the term "Mass' to describe the whole ceremony of the Eucharist. Likewise a more careful investigation of the facts proves that the confession is soundly evangelical on the divine obligation of the Christian Sabbath. Surely, as we come to understand our noble confession better, all objections to it will melt away like mist before the sun, and we shall all accept it heartily, and thus establish our stalwart Scriptural Lutheranism beyond a doubt.

Conspicuous among those whose views were thus modified is Dr. Samuel Sprecher, whose very name is the synonym of Christian grace and gentleness and profound scholarship. Few men have been more sincerely and more deservedly venerated. Since he moved to California, he has frankly avowed the change that has taken place in his theological opinions. In a letter first printed in May, 1891, Dr. Sprecher wrote:

"It is true that I did once think 'the Definite Platform'—that modification of Lutheranism which has perhaps been properly called the culmination of Melanchthonianism—desirable and practicable, and that I now regard all such modifications of our creed as hopeless. In the meantime, an increased knowledge of the spirit, methods and literature of the Missouri Synod has convinced me that such alterations are undesirable—that the ele-

ments of a true Pietism, that a sense of the necessity of personal religion and of the importance of personal assurance of salvatian, can be maintained in connection with a Lutheranism unmodified by the Puritan element."

A letter published a few weeks later is no less explicit as to the Doctor's confessional position:

"When I wrote the 'Groundwork' I said on page 454, 'We consider our creed, just as it is, the best in Christendom. There is no other confession to which we could with as little difficulty subscribe unconditionally; and while we think the forms of some of our doctrines need explanation anew, in the light of the Scriptures and the past experience of the Church—and even modification—we do believe them to be capable of such evangelical interpretation, without affecting the substance of them, or destroying the integrity of the system to which they belong.' Now I would erase the phrase, '*and even modification*,' and would only say that they needed 'explanation,' and that they 'were capable of such evangelical interpretation' *without modification.* And the evangelical spirit and successful operations of our Missouri brethren have led me to dismiss any doubts respecting the practicability of the unconditional adoption of them consistently with all the great spiritual interests which the General Synod has always had in view."

Nothing could be clearer than the Doctor's statements in the foregoing, and yet he is still more explicit in another letter published a few weeks later, when he says:

"When I say that *I give up a modified Lutheranism*, I do not mean by it that I adopt an exclusive Lutheranism. * * While, therefore, *I would repudiate a modified Lutheranism*, I would not thereby un-Lutheranize the doctrinal position of the General Synod," etc.

But that is not all. In January of 1892, after he had taken ample time to weigh what he had previously said, and had been called to account for it by some of his greatly alarmed brethren, he made this clear and positive statement in one of our church papers:

"I can now say, *as I could not formerly*, that, like Spener, I

can for myself accept the Symbols of the Church *without reserve.*"

While we admire Dr. Sprecher for the many splendid achievements of his life, for nothing do we respect him more highly than for this frank avowal of the change in his views. Might not honest, thorough research and keen thinking lead others to accept the Augustana as heartily as Dr. Sprecher now does, and thus put an end to our theological strife? We shall pray and labor and hope for that glad day, which shall be a day of peace and good-will in our beloved General Synod.

Thoroughly honest subscription to the Church's creed is an ethical desideratum. To subscribe to a creed only with the lips and not with the heart, surely cannot be promotive of the subscriber's moral and spiritual life. Take two concrete cases. Here are two young candidates for licensure. The question is asked, "Do you believe the Augsburg Confession to be a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of God's word?" One of them answers, "yes," with all his heart, believing the confession to be Scriptural throughout. The other answers, "Yes," with his lips, but in his mind he carries on a process of cogitation something like this: "I believe some of the articles, such as the first, second and third, but I do not believe the ninth, tenth and eleventh. But then the word *fundamental* affords me a loophole of escape!" Which of the two young candidates stands on the higher ethical plane? Which would the more gladly make a frank and open avowal of the thoughts passing in his mind? The answer is self-evident. The one who accepts the confession without mental reservation.

We would venture to ask another question that we deem relevant: By what right do men who reject our distinctively Lutheran doctrines call themselves Lutherans? Suppose a Baptist should say, "I am a Baptist, a stalwart Baptist, and I do not want any one to call my Baptist principles in question—but then I don't believe in immersion!" Would that be consistent? Would it not be retaining the name while rejecting the very principle for which the name stands? Is it not possible to be only nominally Lutheran? Our question, though a brusque one,

is asked with no less kindness than sincerity, and we think a candid answer would be in order.

It may be said that as Lutherans we accept the doctrine of justification by faith, and that that is our distinguishing doctrine. But the Reformed, the Presbyterian and even the Methodists accept it no less heartily than do we. Some time ago we heard a Reformed doctor of Divinity deliver an address on the subject, "Why I am a Reformed." The first distinctive doctrine he mentioned was the doctrine of justification by faith, for which Zwingli stood as staunchly as did Luther. That doctrine does distinguish Lutherans from Roman Catholics and Arminians, but not from Calvinists and Reformed. What doctrines distinguish Lutherans from these denominations? Our view of the Person of Christ and the sacraments. It would help vastly to clarify the theological atmosphere if some of our doctors who intimate that they cannot accept certain articles of the Augustana, or who, at least, cannot disguise the fact, would tell us clearly and explicitly just what their views of these peculiar doctrines are, and wherein their views differ from the Reformed and Calvinistic views. It would be a satisfaction to know just what they believe with respect to the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist. They may reply that these are theological refinements and distinctions that are of no value. Then why do they write and speak of them at all, and especially why do they reveal so much antagonism to them?

With profound and sincere interest we read Prof. J. W. Richard's article on "The Confessional History of the General Synod," in THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY for October, 1895. We desire to express our great admiration for Dr. Richard, for his painstaking thoroughness and his evident sincerity and desire to be fair. At the time of its publication we think that we expressed our satisfaction with the article in question, and we still are very glad that it appeared; but further thought and research have forced us to modify our views somewhat as to the soundness of Dr. Richard's central position in that contribution. In the first part of the article he declares that the General Synod stands

"for the Augsburg Confession, *the entire Augsburg Confession*" (see page 473; italics his own); and then in the latter part he labors to prove that some doctrines of the confession are non-fundamental. On page 474 he quotes approvingly from Dr. W. M. Baum, who testified under oath "that the constitution of the General Synod 'holds the General Synod responsible for a full and complete acknowledgment of the Augsburg Confession.'" On the same page he cites Dr. Valentine, who wrote in 1872: "In language at once clear and decisive it (the General Synod) has placed itself *squarely and fully* on the great and universal Confession of our Church."

It is difficult to see how the General Synod can be held "responsible for a full and complete acknowledgment of the Augsburg Confession" and plant "itself squarely and fully" upon it, and yet declare that it contains some doctrines that are non-fundamental and therefore need not be accepted. If language means anything at all, then the language of Drs. Baum and Valentine means that the General Synod accepts the Augsburg Confession as to doctrinal content without reserve or equivocation. For some years it has seemed to us that some men want to stand squarely on the confession, and yet they don't want to,—a position that cannot be successfully maintained. We either stand squarely on the confession, or we do not—one or the other—and we can never meet one another in a fair, open, manly issue until all the disputants define their positions with the explicitness of the noon-day sun.

But let us return again to Dr. Richard and his writings. In the *Magazine of Christian Literature* for April, 1892, he expressed himself in the following positive and unequivocal language:

"In thus *heartily* and *unqualifiedly* accepting the Augsburg Confession as her doctrinal basis, and in thus throwing the strongest guards around the teaching from her theological chairs and from her pulpits, the General Synod plants herself firmly and squarely on the original, generic, catholic Lutheranism, the Lutheranism on which Luther, Melanchthon, Brentz and other great reformers had agreed to stand, and on which they did

stand, though, as is well known, they held different shades of view in reference to some doctrines embraced in their common confession. Thus the Augsburg Confession, just that, no more, no less—the creed which gave distinctive life and doctrinal character to the Lutheran Church—is the doctrinal standard of the General Synod."

At the meeting of the General Synod in Hagerstown, Md., in 1895, when the resolution defining the doctrinal position of the General Synod was proposed, Dr. Richard forthwith sprang to his feet and gave that resolution his hearty endorsement in a ringing speech, offering the only remarks that were made at the time. And what was that resolution? Here it is:

"*Resolved*, That in order to remove all fear and misapprehension, this convention of the General Synod hereby expresses its entire satisfaction with the present form of doctrinal basis and confessional subscription, which is the word of God as the infallible rule of faith and practice, and the unaltered Augsburg Confession *as throughout in perfect consistence with it*—nothing more, nothing less."

This is the resolution that Prof. Richard so heartily indorsed at the convention of 1895, declaring that it was the true basis of the General Synod. This was in June. In October of the same year he published his article in THE QUARTERLY on "The Confessional History of the General Synod," in which he adduces a labored argument to prove that some articles of the confession are non-fundamental. Is not this evidence of a change of opinion, or have we failed to grasp the Doctor's proper point of view? Of course, it is no discredit to any investigator honestly to change his opinions, and we have not a word of censure for the Doctor if such a change has occurred in his thinking.

In his "Confessional History" Dr. Richard quotes from a number of Lutheran authorities to prove that some of the articles of the confession have been regarded as non-fundamental by the General Synod. But every one of those excerpts were written either in 1860 or 1864, or previous to that time, and that was before the change in the General Synod's doctrinal attitude, or at the time when the transition was being made. There has

been a good deal of General Synod history and development since 1864, and our Lutheran theologians have come to a clearer apprehension of the real teaching of the Augsburg Confession. Dr. Baum bore his stalwart testimony in 1874; Dr. Valentine wrote in 1872; Dr. Richard wrote his article in the *Magazine of Christian Literature* in 1892, and in 1893 the little book called "The Distinctive Doctrines and Usages of the General Bodies," was issued, containing Dr. Valentine's magnificent article on the General Synod, in which he puts that body unequivocally on the Augustana and breathes not a word about non-fundamental doctrines.

One of the theological writers from whom Dr. Richard quotes to prove his position, is Dr. S. S. Schmucker, for whose ability and piety we have unbounded respect. But let us see what it meant for Dr. Schmucker to regard some of the doctrines of our Augustana as non-fundamental. As he was the author of the Definite Platform, he must have felt that his view of the confession gave him liberty to reject the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper and other doctrines *in toto.* Does Dr. Richard think that our present form of confessional subscription would give a General Synod minister the same liberty?

Again, Dr. Richard speaks several times of the ambiguity of the old form of subscription containing the words "substantially correct." He says on page 485: "The General Synod by her action (1864–1868) *did* intend to clarify and strengthen her confessional basis. She *did* intend to remove the ambiguity contained in the words "substantially correct." But if the General Synod means to say that there are non-fundamental articles in the confession, and then fails or refuses to tell which they are, we cannot see that the "ambiguity" is relieved to any appreciable extent, or that her confessional basis is in any degree clarified or strengthened. What possible advantage has been gained by eliding the word "substantially?" What is the precise difference between the old form of subscription and the new?

We are aware that Dr. Harkey said in 1859 "that there are fundamental doctrines of Christianity, and everybody not spoiled by his theory or philosophy knows what they are." And then

he feels like "sternly rebuking the infidelity which lies concealed beneath this objection," etc. But that was 1859, and this is 1897. We to-day demand clearer definitions. Besides, the question is not whether there are "fundamental doctrines of Christianity" or not, or what they are, but whether the Augsburg Confession is a "correct exhibition" of them. All evangelical Christians accept the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, but that does not make all of evangelical Christians Lutherans. It is only those who accept the Augsburg Confession's exhibition of them who are Lutherans.

In 1864 Dr. Ziegler offered several irenic resolutions, which were adopted by the General Synod. The last is as follows:

"*Resolved*, That this Synod most earnestly recommends to district synods, and urges them to call to account any of its members who may be guilty of denouncing their brethren on account of differences of views on the non-essential features of the Augsburg Confession."

This was a most excellent resolution, but it seems to us that Dr. Richard in his article confesses "non-essential features" and "non-fundamental doctrines." For instance, the precise form of administering private absolution might be a "non-essential feature," according to Article VII, but surely the doctrinal content of the eleventh Article must stand, for it is founded upon express Scriptural teaching. It is said that a quotation in the confession has been erroneously attributed to Augustine. That might be a "non-essential feature," and no one would want to accept a historical error; but that does not affect the doctrinal content of a single article of the Augustana. The question is whether the expression, "non-essential features," aims at any of the *doctrines* of the Lutheran system. In 1864 the General Synod expunged the word "substantially" from her confessional subscription; if she immediately passed a resolution declaring that some of the doctrines of the confession are not fundamental, and can therefore be accepted or rejected *ad libitum*, then she simply nullified her own act. But such is not the case. She simply said that none should "be guilty of denouncing their brethren on account of different views *on* the non-essential fea-

tures of the Augsburg Confession;" which does not mean liberty to reject the distinctively Lutheran doctrines, surely, but rather that no one should try to force his *peculiar interpretation* upon his brethren. For example, if a man should reject the tenth article of the confession, he would be un-Lutheran even in the General Synod's estimation; but if he should heartily accept that article, no one would have a right to say that he must accept any particularistic view,—like that of the Formula of Concord, for example—of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Besides, Christian men should never "be guilty of denouncing their brethren" for *any* cause.

Whatever may have been the state of the case in 1864 and 1868, the time has come in the General Synod's confessional history when men who insist that there are non-fundamental doctrines exhibited in the confession, should enumerate them, and relieve the apprehensive feeling that is extant in the Church; and this is especially necessary when men cast shy insinuations at the confession as if it contained some monstrous Romish errors.

That there is cause for apprehension will be seen from several concrete cases, showing what a liberalistic use men may make of the word "fundamental." We know a General Synod minister who does not accept the doctrine of the vicarious atonement—a doctrine plainly taught in the Scripture and in Article III. of the confession. He defends his Lutheranism by asserting that the doctrine is *not fundamental.* Two General Synod ministers have expressed very strong doubt of the doctrine of eternal punishment, and one of them even presented a series of arguments in favor of the annihilation of the wicked, before a large audience some months ago; both of these men belong to the class who are constantly ringing the changes on "non-fundamental doctrines." See Art. XVII. Some men who can scarcely disguise their sympathy with Dr. Briggs and Lyman Abbott make the same claim. In view of these facts, does any true lover of our Church wonder that some of us are asking for clear-cut and specific definitions? The time may come when

the General Synod shall be forced to define her position in terms that cannot be misunderstood, in order to save herself from disintegration and an influx of rationalism and heresy. An *ex animo* subscription to such a Scriptural confession as the Augustana will at least prevent the General Synod from being leavened with the deadly and deadening errors of liberalism.

Now, we will say that when men cannot honestly accept all the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession, and will frankly express their doubts without assailing those who do accept them, we do not think that they should be pursued or denounced or abused or excommunicated, but rather reasoned with in the most kindly temper, and shown their errors. However, when men boldly assail the Confession, or indulge in sly innuendoes against it, and denounce those who heartily accept it as sixteenth century fossils, such contestants cannot expect to go unchallenged and unanswered, and must be asked to define their own doctrinal position. After all, so much has been written in recent years by our theologians in explanation of the Augsburg Confession and Lutheran doctrine, and their evangelical character has been so often proved, that no minister of thirty or thirty-five and more should be groping in darkness. All that is needed is for all our ministers to read carefully, candidly and critically the scholarly articles and treatises that have been written.

ARTICLE V.

THE PLANET MARS.

By S. F. Breckenridge, Sc. D., Professor in Wittenberg Seminary.

Mars is a small planet. His volume is less than one sixth of the volume of the earth, and his surface a little more than one-fourth of the surface of the earth. His density is a little less than three-fourths and his gravity a little more than one-third of that of the earth. These facts will become more vivid by saying that a cubic foot of matter of the average density of the earth weighed at its own surface weighs 330 pounds, but a cubic foot of matter of the average density of Mars weighed at his own surface weighs only 91 pounds. Again, a man who weighs 150 pounds on the earth would weigh on Mars 57 pounds. In other words if a man weighing 450 on the earth were transferred to Mars he would be quite as active and quite as well fitted to his surroundings as a man of 150 pounds on the earth.

If five feet nine inches is the proper height for a well-proportioned man of 150 pounds, then eight feet four inches is the proper height for a well-proportioned man of 450 pounds weight. On Mars such a huge man would weigh 170 pounds and have at least three times the muscular force of the average terrestrial man.

If Mars has inhabitants and if, physically considered, they are the product of their environment, as evolutionists tell us is the case with the children of the earth, then a Martian should be

Note.—For the facts set forth in this paper the writer has been dependent upon works of astronomy in general, upon astronomical periodicals, and reports of astronomical observatories, and especially upon the report of Lowell Oberservatory Flagstaff, Arizona. At the opposition of Mars in 1894, Mr. Percival Lowell, Prof. W. H. Pickering, and Mr. H. E. Douglass, all trained observers, established an observatory in Arizona for the particular purpose of observing Mars. The report of their observations is perhaps the most interesting and valuable contribution made to the science of astronomy in many years.

about eight feet four inches in stature and weigh 450 pounds on the earth, or 170 pounds on his native soil. Combining the following factors, namely, the diminished density and the diminished gravity of Mars as compared with the earth, and the increased muscular power of the Martialist, it is readily deducible that a Martian laborer would be twelve times as effective as a terrestrial laborer in any ordinary work of excavation. In other words, if a terrestrial laborer can load twelve cubic yards of earth into a cart in one day a Martialist could load one hundred and forty-four cubic yards of his own soil in the same time. Or, if the Martialists should be pleased to undertake some great public work, such, let it be supposed, as a system of canals, then if a given number of terrestrials laborers can excavate one mile of a canal in a given time, the same number of Martian laborers could excavate twelve miles of such a canal in the same time.

Next to Venus Mars is our nearest planetary neighbor. But his distance from the earth varies between wide limits. At his greatest distance from the earth when seen through a telescope with a magnifying power of 500 he presents a disk of a diameter almost precisely equal to the apparent diameter of the full moon seen with the naked eye. But when nearest to us, and under the same power, his disk expands into magnificent proportions, having then an apparent diameter nearly eight times as great as that of the full moon.

At the moment of time when the earth is as nearly as may be on the straight line joining the center of the sun and the center of Mars the planet is said to be in opposition. Two or three months before and after opposition is the time best suited for observing this planet. But all oppositions are not equally favorable to the observer for the reason that while the orbit of the earth is nearly circular the orbit of Mars is decidedly oval. As a consequence, although oppositions occur once in two years and fifty days, the oppositions most favorable for observing occur about once every fifteen or seventeen years.

A favorable opposition took place in 1877, and that year is marked by two of the most notable astronomical discoveries of

this century. It was in the month of August, and the Naval Observatory had just been equipped with the largest refracting telescope at that time in the world. Prof. Asaph Hall turned the huge instrument on Mars. After a few observations on several nights, he announced the discovery of two tiny satellites. These he named Phobos and Deimos. Fortunate opposition! Fortunate equipment! Fortunate professor with his name forever associated with Phobos and Deimos,—Dread and Terror, chariot horses of the god of war!

The other discovery was of an altogether different character and announced from a very different quarter. Schiaparelli, an Italian astronomer, from his obscure observatory at Milan startled the astronomical world by declaring that he had discovered a system of canals upon Mars. At once all telescopes of all sorts from Melbourne to Greenwich were turned upon the planet. Universal disappointment followed. No one could see the canals but the Italian. When it is remembered that his glass was only eight and one third inches in diameter, and that the great Washington refractor of twenty six inches aperture as well as all the enormous reflectors failed to show the canals, it is not surprising that his sensational announcement was received first with incredulity and then with sneers. But the Italian kept resolutely on his way and at the succeeding opposition in 1879 he reported a still larger number of canals together with the additional curious and puzzling fact that some of the canals had doubled,—that two precisely parallel canals were seen where only one had been seen before. This was too much for the men with big and costly instruments. Some of them said that what Schiaparelli saw were phenomena of our own atmosphere, others that the the canals were due to imperfections of his glass projected upon the disk of the planet, still others suggested that he unconsciously transmuted the figments of his own imagination into realities, and some went even so far as to hint at a less venial explanation. For nine years no other astronomer could see the Martian canals. But everything comes to them who know how both "to labor and to wait." In 1886 at an unfavorable opposition Schiaparelli was thoroughly vindicated. A new re-

fractor of twenty-nine inches aperture had been erected at Nice and, aided by a clear and pure atmosphere, it confirmed the observations of the astronomer of Milan. All the canals single and double were reproduced substantially as he had laid them down in his maps. Since then all of his claims have been completely substantiated at other observatories and now there are perhaps twenty persons who can see the canals of Mars.

After this thoroughgoing vindication of the famous Italian astronomer, it was quite a natural inquiry how it happened that a refractor of only eight and one third inches aperture revealed markings which could not be seen through a glass whose diameter is three times as great. The answer to this question promises much for the future of astronomy. It now appears that it is not the biggest telescope which shows the most. Much depends upon a clear, pure and quiet atmosphere, or as Mr. Percival Lowell remarks, "The important point about an observatory is not so much what is its lens as what is its location." If the serene air of Milan could be transported to Washington, there can be no doubt that the large and fine telescope in the Naval Observatory would disclose more than the much smaller instrument by means of which Schiaparelli made his memorable discoveries.

The question whether other worlds than ours are inhabited has been eagerly asked. But an answer based upon observed facts has been impossible until quite lately. The argument in favor of the affirmative briefly stated was as follows: Since our earth is a mere speck, bearing a less ratio to the universe than a grain of sand to the seashore, it seems unreasonable to suppose it to be the only inhabitable world. This argument was so satisfactory to many persons that they peopled all the planets of our solar system and even the sun himself with dense populations. They spoke and wrote about the Saturnians, the Jovians, Mercurials, Lunarians and so on in the same matter-of-fact way with which they referred to the Africans, the Asiatics, or the Australians. But during the last half century new factors have come into the problem, and notably among these the absence of

air or water, or of both air and water in some of the members of our system.

Were it not for the fact that we actually see the water swarming with extremely varied forms of life, and since we ourselves perish in it, it would be natural for us to suppose that no form of life could exist in it. A fish if it could talk and reason might say on similar grounds that life in the air is impossible. It would not, therefore, be sound reasoning to conclude that no form of life could exist in a world which has neither air nor water. But since both air and water are absolutely essential to all the forms of life, animal and vegetable, with which we are acquainted, if it should certainly appear that any planet is without either of these elements the problem of its habitability must be dismissed as altogether beyond our power of solution. The absurdity of any attempt at a solution is neatly illustrated by the chatter of the "young girl" who figures so refreshingly in The Poet at the Breakfast Table. Looking through a telescope at the moon which she had been told lacked air and water, it appears "her delight was unbounded, and her curiosity insatiable. If there were any living creatures there what odd creatures they must be. They couldn't have any lungs or any hearts. What a pity! Did they ever die? How could they expire if they couldn't breathe? Burn up? No air to burn in. Tumble into some of those horrid pits, perhaps, and break all to bits. She wondered how the young people liked it there, or whether there were any young people there; perhaps nobody was young and nobody was old but they were like mummies all of them—what an idea—two mummies making love to each other!" Of course all this is absurdly amusing. But it shows how impossible it is even to talk about forms of life which exist, if there be such, independent of air and water. Certainly no language in our world can furnish the words for rational discourse about any such creatures.

It appears that Mercury has no atmosphere, or so little that it cannot be noted by the most refined observations. This planet revolves but once on its axis while it makes one revolution round the sun. Consequently the same hemisphere faces the

sun perpetually. Life, as we know it, is impossible under such conditions.

Venus has a dense atmosphere. But her polar axis is perpendicular to the plane of her orbit and, like Mercury, she presents the same hemisphere year in and year out to the sun. If Venus has any water it has been driven to her dark side where it would be congealed by a very low temperature. And yet there may be a belt somewhere between the hot and cold hemispheres in which water exists in a liquid form. But however that may be Venus cannot be inhabited.

In our sacred writings it is promised that "while the earth remaineth seedtime and harvest * * summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease." But on both Mercury and Venus these changes have long since ceased if they ever existed. To us they are dead worlds like "ribs of wreck" on the coast of the ages.

As to our moon, it has long been known to be destitute of both air and water. It is a dead world. It has been studied more than any other heavenly body, but it yields no sign of life. No change upon it has ever been certainly noted. The hemisphere turned toward us is made up of enormous craters, larger than any on the earth, towering crags, deep chasms, stretches of desert, without a cloud, a shower, a breath of air, a brook, a river, or any sign of vegetation, making a scene of appalling desolation not even approximately matched anywhere on the face of the earth.

The planets beyond Mars are so remote that the question of their habitability may be dismissed as being beyond our powers of research.

But when we turn to Mars we come into contact with a group of ideas entirely familiar to us. Mars has days and nights only a few minutes longer than our own. He passes through all the seasonal changes,—summer's heat, and winter's cold, seed-time and harvest. Mars has both atmosphere and water, though less abundantly than upon the earth. Like our world Mars has snow or ice caps at each pole. They are observed to increase and decrease in exact accordance with the seasons. As sum-

mer approaches in the southern hemisphere the edge of the snow-cap has been observed retreating toward the pole and closely bordering the melting cap there appears a bluish belt several hundred miles wide and extending completely around the globe. As the snowy edge continues to retreat the bluish belt hugs up close to the melting border of the ice-cap. It would be natural to suppose that as this bluish belt advances toward the pole it would become wider. On the contrary, however, it becomes narrower, and this narrowing process continues until before mid-summer the belt has entirely vanished leaving in its place the desert-like reddish-yellow hue which is the prevailing color of the planet's surface. What is this bluish belt? It is proved to be water by the polarization of the light reflected from it as well as by the circumstances of its formation. What has become of it? The most plausible suggestion is that this ephemeral polar sea has been drained by the canals toward equatorial latitudes.

At the opposition in 1894 Mr. Percival Lowell assisted by two trained observers noted and mapped one hundred and eighty-four canals. They are situated for the most part in the southern hemisphere of the planet,—that being the hemisphere turned toward the earth at favorable oppositions. Their average length is fifteen hundred miles. The longest extends thirty-eight hundred miles,—a stretch which would reach from Portland, Maine, to Portland, Oregon, and then along the coast far into the territory of Mexico.

So far as the canals are concerned, Mr. Lowell's map of Mars looks like a railway map of the United States, except that a railway map is full of sinuosities whilst the Martian canals are perfectly straight.

The system of canals on Mars bears many marks of artificiality. It may be difficult to state in words the difference between design in nature and design in art, but there is no difficulty in apprehending the difference and feeling quite assured that one design is according to nature and the other according to art. A tree with its roots, bark, sap, shaft, limbs and leaves shows marks of a purpose, but when it has been manufactured into a set of furniture the fabricated product exhibits not only

the marks of design but also of artificiality. It is instinctively felt that no natural process not interfered with by man could possibly produce a railway, a canal or a telephone.

Now the more one studies Mr. Lowell's map of Mars the more he becomes impressed by the artificiality of the immense system of canals on his surface. A canal on the earth, could it be seen from Mars, would show a tortuous channel since from motives of economy our canals must follow, as a rule, the winding course of river valleys. Not so on Mars, for on his surface the shortest line is the most economical line,—the surface of Mars being for the most part as level as the prairies of Illinois.

The Martian canals, with a few exceptions, are situated on arcs of great circles. In order to apprehend the deep significance of this fact, let it be supposed that upon a spherical blackboard one thousand lines have been drawn at random. It would be a safe wager of many millions to unity that not one of these lines would be situated in an arc of a great circle. Of course the chance that two of them would be so situated would be still more remote. But on Mars not less than 275,000 miles of canals, forming a network of channels crossing each other at every angle and coursing every point of the compass with startling inflexibility of direction, are situated on arcs of great circles. Is this chance? On the earth are imaginary great circles, but they have no objective reality. No one has seen the equator. The great circles on which ships are supposed to sail are "writ in water." These facts seem to exclude the notion that the Martian canals are due to natural causes. On the other hand they seem to indicate the art of skillful engineers who knew that the shortest path between two points on a sphere is the arc of a great circle.

Of the one thousand lines supposed to have been drawn at random on a spherical blackboard, there would be a great many which would intersect, but the chance that any three of them would intersect at the same point is inconceivably remote. The chance that any one of them would pass through two points of intersection of other lines is still more improbable. But there are canals on Mars that pass through as many as five intersec-

tions of other canals and quite a number of instances of as many as four canals intersecting at the same point. It seems incredible that this is merely a chance arrangement.

Again, as a person raised above the earth, if the railways were visible, would observe at Pittsburg, Columbus or Indianapolis and many other cities radiating centres, so on Mars many points may be noted from which canals take their departure.

At nearly all the points of junction, expansions suggesting huge reservoirs have been observed. Mr. Lowell mapped and named sixty-four such expansions to which in accordance with a certain theory to be mentioned shortly, which he has adopted, he has given the general name of "Oases." The artificiality of these expansions seems almost glaring. They are, I believe, with a single exception uniformly circular or oval. The oval expansions are situated at the termini of the double canals or between them. The single exception just noted is at the intersection of two pairs of twin canals. This expansion is decidedly rectangular, and is limited on every side by the intersecting canals. The circular expansions are always found at the intersections of single canals, although as many as nine converge to the same reservoir. Their size varies very much, but their mean area is about fourteen thousand square miles, that is to say more than one-third the area of Ohio. That these spots are natural lakes seems incredible. On our planet, lakes are bounded by sinuous and even extremely contorted shore lines. On all the earth there is not, I suppose, a circular or oval surface fourteen thousand miles in area, standing out in marked contrast with the general surface. On Mars sixty-three circular or oval areas, marked off distinctly from the rest of the planet, have been observed, and one rectangular spot.

Again, on the earth where two rivers unite, the land in the angle between them is of a cape-like form, or, speaking roughly, the shore-line is convex toward the water at the place of union. Now, as many as eight or nine canals are observed rendezvousing at the same circular spot like the spokes of a wheel to its hub. But what for convenience may be called the shore line of the circular or oval expansion, situated between any two converging

canals, is always concave toward the water,—a phenomenon which is not only unnatural but altogether artificial. One instinctively feels that no processes of nature in our world could possibly produce such straight markings as the canals, such circles or ovals or such an exact rectangle any more than they could produce a set of furniture or a sewing machine.

Another mark of artificiality quite as pronounced as any yet pointed out in this essay remains to be mentioned. Some of the canals are double. Ten pairs may be counted on Mr. Lowell's map. They are precisely parallel. The yellowish strip of soil between any pair varies from thirty to one hundred and fifty miles in width. Some of them are of great length. Mr. Lowell describing an observation of two pairs of canals says: "The Euphrates and its neighbor the Phison I saw beautifully doubled, exactly like two railroad tracks with bright ground between each set extending down the disk for a distance of sixteen hundred miles." Natural processes produce some parallels as in chrystals. But parallels extending for hundreds of miles and visible at a distance of twenty thousand miles or more are not found on the surface of the earth. They can be produced but only by artificial means.

The canals vary in width from twenty-five to thirty-five miles. This fact seems to forbid the idea that they are altogether water courses. Several theories have been proposed, but the most probable theory, the one having fewest objections, and explaining the most facts, suggested first, I believe, by Prof. W. H. Pickering of Harvard University and adopted by Mr. Lowell, is that what the observer sees is not canals but vegetation which borders canals or channels of water too narrow to see. Though they may be used for the purposes of transportation and indeed some of them probably are highways of commerce, yet they seem to have been constructed primarily to irrigate a dry and thirsty land. This theory explains the wide expansion at the junctions of the canals. The converging channels carrying the gift of the ephemeral polar sea to more genial latitudes empty into these expansions or oases and make the "desert blossom as

the rose." A further evidence of the vegetal character of the canals is found in the fact that canals directed from the equator toward the pole are first seen in lower latitudes and as the Martian summer advances they can be detected as though growing toward higher lattitudes.

Ever since the telescope was turned on Mars very extensive stretches of dark areas have been noted and mapped. They were supposed to be oceans and were described as of a bluish-green color. They really form one ocean belting with very irregular outline on the whole planet, situated for the most part south of the equator. All of the canals mapped by Mr. Lowell are connected with this dark so-called oceanic area. It is itself also interlaced by numerous canals which are traced by a still darker marking. The conclusion is that this "ocean" is not an ocean of water but an ocean of vegetation fed by irrigating canals which year after year drain the fugacious polar sea. The theory that the canals, oases and vast ocean like expanses are vegetal derives additional confirmation from the fact that the tone of their coloring varies with the progress of the seasons.

According to the view just presented there are no oceans on Mars, no rivers, no springs, rare clouds and rarer showers, and no elevations that rise into the dignity of mountians. It follows also that the mode of circulation of the water on Mars is different from that of the earth. The limits of this essay forbid a discussion of that important matter.

An attempt has been made to construct an argument based on facts of observation to prove that Mars is inhabited. The evidence is purely circumstantial, but juries condemn men to death on circumstantial evidence.

As to the case in hand, it seems to the writer that no ground remains for even an unreasonable doubt that Mars is inhabited by an intelligent and industrious people.

ARTICLE V.

MOSES AS A SCHOLAR.

By Rev. H. H. Hall, D. D.

We have, now, almost complete information of the times and peoples, in which and among whom, Moses lived. Egyptologists have succeeded in making much that hitherto was hidden and unintelligible, entirely plain. Prof. Flinders Petrie, who recently found the stone tablet, which gives an account of Israel's bondage, spent many years of careful research in the land of the Pharaohs and has contributed largely to the world's enlightenment. His magic spade unearthed what for thousands of years was lost to man's knowledge, and so dispelled the great darkness and mystery in these matters. Dr. James Henry Breasted an eloquent lecturer in Chicago University, was long a co-worker with Professor Petrie, in his vast explorations, and reads the manuscripts of five thousand years ago, at sight. Mr. George B. Raum, another talented and energetic American, is now pushing the quest of the archives of Egypt with rare zeal, and his experiences and discoveries are most romantic to hear. He says: "It is strange to realize that the civilization of ancient Egypt, had reached a higher point, in many respects, than that of ours to-day. In civil engineering, for instance, we have nothing to compare with them. When Greece was learning her letters Egypt was far advanced in science and art: In astronomy, too, great progress had been made." He goes on to state that many of our later day inventions are only recoveries of those known in ancient Egypt. Dr. Naville, Professor Erman, Georg Ebers, and others have also added much sound erudition, by their earnest and untiring labors. And yet, in spite of the fact that we have become so well acquainted with this early age, it is remarkable how little we know, to a positive certainty, of the life and doings of the illustrious Jewish prophet and law-giver. There is room for a world of conjecture. What the writer has

here set down is all reasonable, but he knows, that someone else might write an altogether different chapter, with just as much plausibility. No theme, however, in connection with Bible literature, is more interesting, and its unusual fascination induces us to make a venture.

The tribe of Levi had given themselves to the study of the higher culture, which flourished along the Nile. Belonging to this tribe, were Amram and Jochebed, whose character may be supposed by their names; the former means, "Kindred of the Lofty One," the latter, "Whose glory is Jehovah." These parents had an extraordinary off-spring, in the three children, the fruit of their marriage, Miriam, Aaron and Moses. Doubtless this was due, very largely to their remaining true to the religion of their forefathers, and uncontaminated by the idolatry which was all around them. It has happened, that a mother felt sad when she was informed that her babe was a girl, because "a woman's life is so hard," but now this mother must have felt a pang when she learned that a boy was born to her. Had she knowledge of a legend, which may have come down with her people from the land of Chaldea? It is a beautiful story inscribed upon the clay tablets of the royal library of Chaldea, that the great King, Sargon I, was born secretly on the banks of the Euphrates. That his mother made an ark of bulrushes, and lined it within with bitumen, and laid him in the river. That he was borne away by the waters and mercifully taken out and brought up as a son, and afterwards became king. It is easy to believe that Jochebed, as a woman of intellectual refinement, had heard of this tradition and acted upon the suggestion, in the case of her child. And so, out by the banks of one of the canals of the Nile, among the papyrus reeds, near Tanis—the land of Zoan—where the family lived, the future lawgiver was placed and Thermouthis,* the sister of Rameses and her attendant maids found him.

*In the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia, it is stated, that it may have been Bintantha, nearly Bent Anet of "Uarda," or, Meri, daughters of Rameses II, or Thermut, the daughter of Seti I, and both sister and wife of Rameses II.

If the land of one's nativity has any influence in shaping the mind, and giving it incentive, surely that would have the noblest and most inspiring effect, in which Moses was born and spent his youth. Four thousand years ago, the region about the Nile delta was picturesque, and everywhere was a scene of busy life and civilization. The land of Goshen was so rich and fertile, that it was described as equaling the glories of the garden of Eden. The meadows were green and beautiful, and the landscape, varied by cities, which vied with Thebes, was shady and verdant on account of its vines and almond and fig trees and high palms. Upon the walls of the temple of Karnak, there is a plan of Tanis, made in the time of Seti I. The Tanis branch of the Nile ran through it, in which lived the crocodile and grew aquatic plants. Rameses II, afterward beautified it and made it his special residence, with his splendid court. Geikie says: "In its glory, as Moses saw it, with its countless statues, obelisks, sphinxes, and other monuments, and its great temples and majestic royal palace, it must have been imposing in its magnificence; especially in the eyes of the Hebrew population, in whose midst it had risen like a city of enchantment, though at a fearful cost of suffering to themselves." A sunset, at Suez, described by that eminent Oriental scholar, Professor Georg Ebers, of the University of Leipsic, doubtless was often witnessed by Moses. "The water quivered in still lovelier colors than at noon, and the finely formed Ataka hills on the west shore, stretching away to the south till they seemed to fade into the glowing horizon, were bathed in blue and violet mists, which after a time, gave place to a splendor of color that I never saw elsewhere on the Nile. The mountains looked as if they were a moulton mass of blended pomegranite and amethyst, and as such mirrored themselves in the waves which ran up to their feet—ebbing and retiring, moment by moment." Even the night, with its wondrously bright moon and unnumbered stars, was a "dream of beauty."

The opportunities which Moses enjoyed for the study of art and architecture, and the laws of those times, were certainly very unusual. Just what relation he sustained to Egyptian royalty,

we do not know. That he was near to his mother and family, and people, is evident from his knowledge of them, and his remaining a Hebrew in his life and sympathies.* He was much in the home of his parents, and at the same time, according to the Scriptures, was familiar with the luxuries and "treasures in Egypt." He may have played when a child, in the halls of those splendid palaces, and in the charming gardens and groves which surrounded them, and by right of his sonship with the daughter of Pharaoh, had all the privileges and prestige of a member of the regal household. The age was one of extraordinary activity in the erection of structures of colossal size, and already possessed many of the remarkable works of preceding kings. The pyramids had been erected long before, and still stand in their mountainous solidity and grandeur, as records of the belief of the builders in immortality and the resurrection. What a sight must they have presented, when their sides were yet perfect with polished casing and covered from bottom to top with inscriptions, and carved with sculpture. The Great Pyramid, higher than any spire of Europe, contained enough material to build a wall of stone from Boston to San Francisco, two feet thick and six feet high. It is the largest structure ever erected by man, covering more than four acres, and has been estimated as having cost $165,000,000. These were built eight or nine centuries before Moses, and three or four hundred years before Abraham. Thebes was in the height of her splendor. She extended seven miles along both banks of the Nile, with her shady streets and gay busy life. On the east bank of the river stood the famous residence of the Pharaohs. The city had one hundred gates, and could send out two hundred chariots, and ten thousand fighting men, at each one of them. Near by were the wonderful edifices of Karnak, Luxor, and Medinet Aboo. In Karnak was the temple of Ammon, the Egyptian

*Rameses, after conquering the Khita, or Hittites, made a treaty with them, and consolidated the peace, by marrying the daughter of their king. It has been thought that this woman had something to do in directing the interest of Moses, in favor of the Hebrews, rather, than of the Egyptians.

Jupiter, covering nine acres of ground. Memphis was twenty miles south of On, with fine gardens and great temples and palaces. From her gardens, in later times, roses were sent to Rome in winter, and her vineyards yielded wines of which poets sang, and long after Christ she had "works so wonderful that they confused even a reflecting mind, and such as the most eloquent would not be able to describe." The Sphinx, the Labyrinth, and many other magnificent buildings, added to the grandeur and fame of the time. The arts had also made considerable progress. Veneering and inlaying were known. Iron had long been brought from the neighborhood of Mt. Sinai. Ebony was imported from Ethiopia, mahogany from India, firs and junipers from Syria, cedars from Lebanon, and costly and elegant materials from all parts of the world.*

Of the personal characteristics of the youthful Moses, it is said, in the Acts, that he was "exceeding fair," and in Hebrews he is called "a proper child." Josephus relates that his person was so striking that people stopped to look at him when he passed. He doubtless had rare natural gifts, and when we consider the facilities which were afforded him for education, he must have ranked fully the equal of any scholar in the world. Ancient history begins with Egypt. India and China have no records for centuries afterward. The literary remains of Babylon, Chaldea, and Assyria, bear evidence of a more recent date than the pyramids and obelisks. The inscriptions inform us that the art of writing was practiced in Egypt at a very early day. An edifice, statue, or obelisk, was seldom erected without being covered with figures and characters. Articles of apparel, workmen's tools, and other possessions buried in the tombs, have the names of the owners impressed or engraved upon them. Remains of papyrus manuscripts have been found, which date back even to the age of Joseph. In the fourth dynasty, the writings of the pyramids and sepulchers give us reliable infor-

*The art of engraving and the use of fine fabrics and precious stones and metals, in drapery and other furnishings of the Tabernacle, had attained great proficiency among the Jews, after the Exodus. They must have acquired this skill while they were in Egypt.

mation of the arts of life. The inkstand and reed-pen at that early day prove that linen and papyrus were used. Egypt early became famous all over the world for drugs and physicians. Athothis, the Son of Menes, it is said, was a physician and wrote works on anatomy. Homer speaks of the Egyptians, as "sons of Paeon, skillful above all men." Memphis was the seat of Æsculapius. Medical books were in the sacerdotal library, and all of them attributed to Hermes, or Thoth. Embalming was done in the time of Jacob. We would not imply that the masses were intelligent. There is no evidence that books made up part of the furniture of the home, and there are no characters or inscriptions representing the ordinary man or woman reading. Learning was in the custody of the priests, who guarded it as their peculiar treasure. That it had a wide scope is evident from the fact that the most eminent of the Greeks, Lycurgus, Solon, Thales, Pythagoras, Plato, and others, gathered from it much of politics, geometry, astronomy and physics. Morals and ethics were also taught. The library of Rameseum, at Thebes, founded by Rameses II, contained 20,000 books. In the entrance stood a statue of Thoth, the god of wisdom, and one of Safek, the goddess of history. There were also other libraries. One was in the temple of Ptah, at Memphis. At Chennu was a university of great renown. While the temples of religion were mainly in the large cities, the priests were scattered over the entire kingdom, and as they were the astronomers, architects, judges and physicians, and had charge of science and learning, it is probable that every temple had its library.*

*The late Amelia B. Edwards, author of A Thousand Miles up the Nile, claimed that the earliest known novel is The Tale of the Two Brothers, an Egyptian story, the original manuscript of which is in the British Museum. It is written upon nineteen sheets of papyrus, in a fine hieratic hand, and has upon its back the signature of Prince Seti Mereuptah, who evidently ordered it to be composed.

James Freeman Clarke, in his Ten Great Religions, also says: "We are acquainted with several collections of precepts and maxims on the conduct of life. The most venerable of them is the work of Ptahhotep, which dates from the age of the pyramids and yet appeals to the authority of the ancients. It is undoubtedly, as M. Chabas called it, "The most ancient book of the world." The manuscript at Paris which contains it

The most renowned university, however, was at On, or Heliopolis, situated at the southern limit of Goshen. "The House of Seti," at Thebes, rivaled it. Great sums had been expended to make it a famous seat of philosophy. In addition to the thousands of papyrus rolls in the library, there was in connection with it a manufactory of papyrus, at the disposal of the learned. But, having been brought up and educated at this university, the more proficient and gifted only were sent to Heliopolis, where in the "Hall of the Ancients" was the most celebrated medical faculty, and then came back to Thebes, "endowed with the highest honors of surgery." Here they were physicians to the king or teachers or were consulted in serious and difficult cases. Heliopolis had its quiet houses for the professors and shady cloisters served as lecture rooms for the students. There were great colleges of priests, and teachers of medicine and history. The temple was in the height of its glory, and its observatory, while not so large as that at Babylon, was as famous, for its horizon was wide and free from cloud and vapor. At this famous school, the center of thought and worship, the Jerusalem of Egypt according to tradition, Moses received his education. It is probable that the priests, who were the patrons of all learning, were his companions. In the library and writing rooms were numerous scribes, and in the dependencies lived a huge population, so that he had the very finest facilities for becoming acquainted also with the life of the Egyptians as he passed on his way to the lectures of the different faculties.*

It happens, though, very often that the best of one's educa-

was written centuries before the Hebrew lawgiver was born. These books are very similar in character and tone to the Book of Proverbs in the Bible. They inculcate the study of wisdom, the duty to parents and superiors, respect for property, the advantages of charitableness and content: of liberality, humility, chastity and sobriety; of truthfulness and justice, and they show the wickedness and folly of disobedience, strife, arrogance and pride; of slothfulness, intemperance, unchastity and other vices."

*Here the halls used to be shown, in which Plato studied. He learned mathematics in Egypt. His studies here, no doubt, influenced what he wrote about the divine nature. There is a tradition that Plato even borrowed from Egypt the laws of his Republic.

tion is not obtained at colleges and universities, but through the hard and trying experiences of life, and observations of surrounding conditions. Lincoln lived among the people. He was one of them in the best sense. He came up out of the very humblest place, and knew what hardship and poverty are, and had trial himself of every phase of adverse and straightened circumstances. In the words of Dr. Cuyler, he was graduated from "the grand college of free labor, whose works were the flatboat, the farm, and the back-woods lawyer's office." And thus he got the fund of good sense and judgment, and the practical wisdom, which made him the great prophet and master in the most perilous and needful time of the government. Doubtless, in the same manner, Moses had the most impressive lessons in what he beheld round about him. In the school of actual, real life, his thought and character were mostly shaped. Seti I. and his son Rameses the Great, the most illustrious of the Pharaohs, were now the rulers.* It is generally agreed, that the latter was the Pharaoh of the Oppression, and his reign of sixty-seven years falls probably somewhere in the fourteenth century before Christ. He was the national hero of the Egyptians and has been much celebrated in legend and poetry. The outside world knew him as the great Sesostris, and attribute to him many heroic deeds. He must have died in very old age as his mummy, found in 1886, indicates him to have been almost if not altogether a centenarian. It was the policy of Rameses on account of his fears of an uprising which might be strengthened by the residents of the Delta, to break their spirit by oppressing them. Everywhere throughout the land, he erected temples, founded towns, dug canals† set up statues and colossi and sphinxes

*According to Ebers, Seti I. was reigning when Moses was born, Rameses was a child. Brugsch fixes the date of Moses' birth in the sixth year of the reign of Rameses.

†There is a most interesting fact in connection with the Suez canal. Napoleon Bonaparte suggested the construction of a canal across the isthmus, and had a survey made to that end. Some years afterward a corps of engineers, among whom was Robert Stephenson, reported the enterprise impracticable, because the Mediterranean and Red seas had exactly the same mean level. In 1854 M. de Lesseps undertook the work

and the numerous inscriptious found on them, and in the tombs indicate the prodigious cost of human wretchedness and misery at which they were built. Fragments still remain and are the wonder of the world. It may be that each of these gigantic structures represents hundreds of lives of poor slaves, from Africa, or Asia, beaten to death by inhuman masters, or they fell down and died of heat and exhaustion. The Hebrews were less cruelly used, but such sights and the sufferings of his people produced their effect upon Moses. What must have been his thoughts as he, even in his childhood, witnessed the cruelties perpetrated by unfeeling task-masters, or heard the protests of his parents, or the groans and sighs of his countrymen! It is easy to suppose that he often stole away from the palace and companionship of the ruling class, and condoled with his brethren in bondage. May be they discussed measures for bringing their wrongs to an end, or strengthened one another in patience and waiting until the Almighty in his own time should deliver them. And so he who under God was to organize a new state and give laws to a peculiar people, learned in Egypt the grand truths of equity, equality and brotherhood. In that age and land the condition of the common people was one of great limitation. The working classes had a hard lot, and that their indignation against their employers was violent, is plainly to be seen from the fragments of statues found in the wells, and otherwise dishonored and broken. Thirty thousand died while digging, in forced labor, a canal with their hands and without picks, shovels and wheelbarrows. All these things had much to do in preparing Moses to frame a code of laws that were humane and recognized the rights of man.

The career of Moses, however, as a learner in Egypt, suddenly came to an end. His espousal of the cause of the Hebrew, as against the Egyptian, it has been thought was a signal for a general uprising in behalf of freedom. But the sign, if intended was not recognized, and immediate flight was neces-

and the canal was finally opened in 1869, running much of the way on the line of one dug by Rameses II. This seems to be still another evidence of skill in engineering among the Egyptians.

sary. And while the record of his sojourn in Midian is very meagre, no part of the history affords such inducement for agreeable surmise. At the time of his departure he must have been, judging from his disposition and extraordinary opportunities, a man of rare scholarship. He knew much of art and science and laws, and his mind was enriched by companionship with the most erudite and the most luxurious and greatest of mankind. There is no doubt at all but that he carried with him the true instincts of the scholar. It is not probable that he at once gave up all intellectual labors and became wholly absorbed in the keeping of sheep. On the other hand, even in his exile, he doubtless pursued his investigations and studies for which he had ample advantages as we shall see.

The Midianites were descendants of Abraham, through Keturah, and for that reason would receive Moses upon the most friendly terms. He therefore turned his thought very naturally to their country as a refuge from the wrath of Egypt's King. Thither he fled and joined himself to the head of the tribe, who was both civil and religious ruler. In due time he married Zipporah—"the little bird"—one of the seven daughters of the chief. Now the sudden advent of a scholar into his home must have been an event of no small satisfaction and importance to Reuel. And Moses in this seclusion and under this protection and patronage, and engaged in the quiet occupation of shepherd, could mature his knowledge, both by meditation and further research. The ruggedness and rocky wildness of the region would doubtless be a pleasing contrast to the level country from which he came, and he would be strongly influenced by the clear air and bare rock and beautiful sky. The woodland at that time was plentiful, and acacias and tamarisks and palms with rich harvests of dates, grew in great profusion. Other natural products, among which were strong scented plants graced the steep precipices and covered the valleys with a rich green. The Sinai mountains themselves rank among the wildest of regions. "Were I a painter," says Ebers, "and could I illustrate Dante's Inferno, I would have pitched my camp-stool here, and have filled my sketch-book, for there could never be wanting to the

limner of the dark abyss of the Pit, landscapes savage, terribly, immeasurably sad, unutterably wild, unapproachably grand and awful." How all this must have impressed Moses with the majesty of God! In the midst of these silences and solitudes of these wild and rocky regions, he listened to the voice of his great thoughts. In the beautiful words of Geikie: "What long wrestlings of soul; what ponderings over the mysteries of nature as seen around and above him; what mental struggles with the teachings of his Egyptian masters; what contrasts of the gods of the Nile valley in all their higher and lower aspects, with the traditional faith in the one living and true God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, must have passed through his soul before Jehovah stood out alone, supreme, universal, as the Holy Lord God of heaven and earth!"*

The facilities at the command of Moses for yet increasing his knowledge, were very remarkable. Reuel was doubtless himself a man of education and may have been the repository of the learning of his people. His tribe was both rich and powerful. Many of them dwelt in cities, but mostly they lived a nomadic life and wandered from place to place where pasture could be found for their flocks. Moses belonged to the latter class, who in their wanderings visited all parts of the tract between Palestine and Egypt, and even extended their travels into Arabia. The Arabs were early celebrated for their knowledge and literature, and it is easy to be seen that Moses, if he had been so inclined, could have visited Babylon and other seats of learning. His writings show that he had as exact knowledge of the

*There is a charming picture of Moses, in Uarda. Pentaur had escaped from his persecutors, in the region of Sinai, and by the mountains, where was the pure air and still solitude, he knelt down to pray and praise. By the conditions of his past life, and hard trying experiences and sufferings he was now a seeker after truth. As he rose from his knees a man stood by him; "his eyes were piercing and his tall figure had the dignity of a king, in spite of his herdsman's dress." This bearded stranger assured the poet, that if he sought God, he would find him, for he himself had had a manifestation of him upon that very spot. Having imparted this instruction and comfort to the noble hero, the prophet of the wilderness turned away and disappeared behind a rock.

customs, history, and topography of Chaldea, Canaan and the Desert as he had of Egypt. So it is altogether probable, since he had these sources of information right to his hand, that he made a careful personal study of the literature of these peoples and the physical characteristics of these countries.*

And now as to these literary resources, very little need be said to show how abundant they were and how broad their scope. About two hundred years after the flood we find the descendants of Noah, in the land of Shinar. The alluvial deposits of the two great rivers, Tigris and Euphrates, made this a desirable spot to which the inhabitants would naturally be drawn, and it was here that the first great monarchy was founded. The Accadians, whom the ancestors of Abraham found in their migration from Arabia, had already a culture and civilization. They were distinguished for their astronomical observations, had a graded system of measures and weights and remains of their literature are now in European museums, embracing works on geography, astrology, mythology, grammar, mathematics and even poems and legends and an epic. The Chaldeans became the successors of the Accadians, and possessed themselves of their learning. Berosus, who lived about 250 years before Christ, was a priest of Belus, and wrote a history of that country. The materials of his book, he professed to have obtained from the archives of the temple, and are regarded in the main reliable. Alexander, on his expedition to Persia, sent to Aristotle astronomical observations, which had been taken in the temple of Belus, covering a space of time of 1903 years. There were libraries at Senkereh, Babylon, Accad, Ur, Erech, Nineveh,

*Rawlinson says: "Had Moses during these years any presentiment of his future, and did he consciously seek to prepare himself for it? Our answer must be negative." Of course, we allow that he did not, consciously prepare himself for the work to which God finally called him. But he may still have engaged in literary pursuits while in Midian, and that he did so seems to be proven by his editing the book of Job. Here it was he obtained this beautiful poem from the Arabs and with some alterations addressed it to the Israelites. This fact suggests very plainly that he spent his leisure in study and writing and would sedulously continue the quest for knowledge, as opportunity might be afforded him.

and many other cities. Among these peoples there were legends of the creation of the world, the fall of man, the flood,* and the destruction of the tower of Babel. These are grotesque and fanciful, it is true, but it is generally admitted now that older traditions, common to all the nations, were the origin of these, and from them the later ones were gradually corrupted. Moses wrote of the creation, basing his record upon the earlier and purer legends. After his opening account of the origin of all things, and of events in the beginning of human history, he takes up the life of Abraham. It was necessary in writing the annals of Israel to include the history of their progenitor. Many things as the genealogies and other records were kept by the patriarch himself, and handed down from father to son, but it is not impossible that Moses made personal journeys to all places of interest, and searched the archives and libraries so that he might be able to write with fidelity and exactness in all matters.

The man, therefore chosen of God to be the deliverer and law-giver of his own peculiar people, and at the same time lay the foundation of the most remarkable work, the most stupendous miracle of all ages—the Bible—was at every school in the world. It goes without saying of course, that he was inspired, but the method of the Almighty is always to let a man exhaust his own powers and resources first before helping him. If he could find out by his own efforts the topography of a country, or inform himself of any data by consulting the sources and depositories of facts and knowledge, he certainly would be allowed to do so. Providence is plainly seen all along the course of Moses' preparation for his wonderful career, and surely no man in the entire history of the race ever had such opportunities for scholarship. It is only by consideration of him in this light that we can get an idea of how much higher he towered up than any other man

*There is a legend of this event written in the seventh century, B. C. It was taken from another, in the priestly library of Erech, a town built in the first Chaldean empire. This last must date as far back as seventeen centuries B. C., perhaps even to Abraham's day. And that is not all, but even this was transcribed from a still older manuscript cotemporary with the flood itself, one of the oldest documents yet known.

of his age. The Pentateuch was written by one who had knowledge of all that could then be learned, and in the time when the events related were actually occurring.*

*The Dean of Canterbury, in an article in *Living Papers*, entitled, The Mosaic Authorship and Credibility of the Pentateuch, says: "It is easy to criticise and contradict details, but the combination of topographical correctness and exact knowledge of manners and customs in four distinct and dissimilar regions forms a very convincing argument. And what deserves careful attention is, that the argument is strengthened by each increase of our knowledge. The careful survey of the wilderness of the wandering, by government officials would have disproved the Mosaic account if it had been a late production, written anywhere else than on the spot. So our increased knowledge of Egypt would have detected numerous glaring inaccuracies had the history been written by one dwelling in Palestine. Finally, the discovery of these Chaldean legends seems decisive as to the fact that the author must have had Chaldean materials before him, and apparently at a time when they were not debased and degraded by the introduction of the puerile polytheism which now forms so large a portion of their contents."

ARTICLE VI.

SKETCH OF GIDEON SCHERER.

By James A. Brown, D. D.

Gideon Scherer was born Dec. 2nd 1811, in Guilford county, N. C. He was the oldest son of Rev. Jacob Scherer. Of his early life we have no account except what we learn from surviving relatives. He commenced preparing for the ministry some time after his marriage, under Dr. Hazelius in the Theological Seminary at Lexington, S. C., and supported himself and family during his preparatory studies by tailoring, that being his trade. He was licensed by the N. C. Synod in 1840, and soon afterward removed to Wythe county, Va., serving several churches in connection with his father until the formation of the South West Virginia Synod in 1842. He was ordained at its first convention in Floyd county, Va., and at once received and accepted a call to the congregations in Botetourt county, as successor of Rev. Samuel Sayford. Here he served four congregations for about five years with very great success. From

the labors of his first year he reported to Synod twenty-four infant baptisms, eighty adult baptisms, seventy-three confirmations. At the next meeting of Synod he was appointed to visit the city of Richmond in the interests of our Church. He discharged this duty and made a very satisfactory report of the prospect for organizing a church at the capital of the State, and this may properly be regarded as the initiatory step in the organization of our present mission in that city.

In the second year of his labors in Botetourt county, he reports as follows on the state of religion in his congregations: "The work of the Lord still prospers in this part of his moral vineyard. The Church becomes more and more awake to her duties. The 153 members added to my congregations during the late revival have been faithful with but few exceptions. The people are becoming more alive to the education of their children. Sabbath schools are more appreciated than formerly," &c. It was through his faithful labors and untiring energy that this charge became so large and strong that a division of the field became necessary, and Zion and Pine Grove were formed into a separate pastorate. In this field he labored for about six years with the same success which attended his former labors.

To say that Rev. Gideon Scherer was a successful minister of the Gospel is not enough. He was eminently successful. Whilst his education was somewhat limited, he was blessed with a strong mind, which in connection with his fervent piety, his great energy and his unabating zeal, made him a power in the Church, and we hesitate not to say that few men in this synod have done more to promote personal piety among the people, to develop and build up the Church than he did.

It is well known by those who knew him that Gideon Scherer was an ardent friend of revivals of religion. And it would seem from his reports to Synod that his churches were in a constant state of revival, and this seemed to be his proper element. He loved to mingle in such scenes. I have seen him in the anxious meeting among those who were crying for mercy, endeavoring to soothe the wounded spirit and bind up the broken heart.

And as some sin-burdened soul would find peace in believing I have witnessed the joy that lighted up his countenance.

But whilst he was a decided advocate of revivals of religion yet he loved the Church and her confessions, and never believed that adherence to the Augsburg Confession and Luther's Catechism were at all at variance with vital piety and genuine revivals of religion.

Gideon Scherer was a man of ardent piety. He enjoyed communion with God. He was a beautiful illustration of a sincere earnest character. No one ever entered with more zeal into any measure that would advance the interests of Christ's kingdom, or result in the salvation of souls than he. His heart was full of the work in which he was engaged, and he could join with the angels in heaven in rejoicing over repenting sinners. His deep devotion and earnestness sometimes made him the object of persecution. Enemies would attempt to thwart his purposes in endeavoring to introduce more strict and scriptural measures in promoting the interests of the Church, and his course was considered by some as extravagant and fanatical, and he was called on to pass through some severe trials in the measures he adopted to produce a better state of things in the Church. But, strong in his conviction of right; nothing could intimidate him. He went forth in God's name and in God's strength, and the work of the Lord greatly prospered in his hands. Prof. Painter says in his "Historical Sketch:" "In reference to Rev. G. Scherer's work we may say that he added more to the Church than any before him. Some of the most substantial members now belonging to the charge were added under his ministry."

Although Bro. Scherer had not the advantages of a classical education himself, yet he was thoroughly alive to the importance of an educated ministry, and was a warm friend of education in general. The establishment of Roanoke College, and its location at Salem, is indebted to him perhaps more than to any other man. Having been intimately associated with him in the board of trustees for many years, I know whereof I speak in bearing witness to his untiring faithfulness in behalf of that institution.

But for his labors it is doubtful whether Roanoke College would be where and what it now is. In addition to the duties connected with a country charge, in which he preached twice every Sabbath, he had the general supervision of the main building, going from his home to Salem almost every day about six miles distant, engaging material and superintending the work. We scarcely think that justice has been done his memory in the historical sketches given to the world of the founders of this institution. But in this, as in all his labors, Gideon Scherer never sought notoriety. If good was accomplished he had his reward.

I have said that Gideon Scherer was a decided advocate of revivals of religion. And without pretending to pass upon the measures he adopted and the course he pursued, we merely mention it as an item of church history. Of course he was regarded by some as fanatical and un-Lutheran. But that the churches in his charge were wonderfully built up, and that we owe our present degree of prosperity in our churches and institutions of learning in a great measure to these revivals, we dare not deny. And no doubt the future historian of the Lutheran Church in this territory will do justice to the fathers and founders of our synod who labored and toiled to give us a habitation and a name.

Gideon Scherer was also a strict disciplinarian. He made no compromise with sin in any form, and never hesitated to bring wrong-doers to account, no matter who they were, when he believed the cause of Christ demanded it and the purity of the Church was endangered. He was sometimes considered harsh in his reproofs, was censured and condemned by the world, but no one who knew him well could doubt his sincerity or the purity of his motives, and when

> "Assailed by scandal and the tongue of strife,
> His only answer was a blameless life."

Gideon Scherer removed with his family to Columbus, Texas, in 1854. Here he resumed his labors in the ministry, retaining his connection with this synod (S.W.Va.) until his death, which occurred June 2, 1861, after a long and painful illness. When his death was announced to this body a committee was appointed

to prepare an obituary notice which will be found in the minutes of 1861.

Thus father and son have gone where the faithful pastors wait to welcome their flocks being gathered one by one.

ARTICLE VII.

THE UNCONSCIOUS SPIRIT OF HERESY.

By Rev. Julius F. Seebach, A. M.

"Not every error is heresy, though every heresy which is blameworthy cannot be heresy without some error. What, therefore, makes one a heretic I think it is perhaps impossible, certainly very difficult, to comprehend in a regular definition." So says Augustine, the champion of orthodoxy. He was puzzled by the various applications of the term, as many another has been since. Yet, it is necessary that some definition be adopted. Whether it be comprehensive or not, it must express the central truth of the word, or, at least, the meaning most generally given to it.

The word "heresy" primarily meant "choice." This marked it as a subjective expression, denoting an act of will. Beginning with this moral meaning, it soon attained a secondary sense, being applied to what was the choice of a group of thinkers that held some ideas in common. Thus we come to hear of the "heresy" of the Stoics and Epicureans, of the Pharisees and Sadducees and Nazarenes.* In this application the moral meaning was lost. Every use of the word was indifferent to praise or blame. Even Paul speaks of "the most straitest 'heresy' of our religion" (Acts 26 : 5) in a manner that has not the shadow of censure.

As soon, however, as "a clear and absolute authority in matters of faith"† began to be recognized, the conception of "heresy" changed. The choice that before had been a matter of in-

*Acts 5 : 17; 15 : 5; 24 : 5.

†Phillips Brooks, Essays and Addresses, "Heresy," p. 8.

difference was now a sin when exercised against the established power. The moral element was restored. Already in the New Testament we have the beginnings of this usage. In the Acts (24 : 14) Luke speaks of "the way which they call 'heresy;'" Paul, in the first letter to the Corinthians (11 : 19) mentions the heresies that must be among them, and, in enumerating "the works of the flesh" to the Galatians (5 : 19–21), he couples heresy with adultery and drunkenness; Peter, in his second epistle, (2 : 1), warns against "false teachers, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies;" while once the concrete form is used when Paul advises his son Titus (3 : 10) concerning "a man that is a heretic." And in the writings directly following these the same idea was carried out. Heresy was called a sin, not because it was in error, but because it retained its position in obstinate wilfulness against the authority of God's word.

But even in the later writings mentioned there began to be a change in point of view. The struggle of the Christians with their persecutors led to more definite organization. Increased authority was given to those who were appointed as leaders of the churches. The duty of maintaining the purity of the faith was delegated to them. And gradually, with the establishment of their position, anything opposed to their opinion became worthy of the dreaded stigma of heresy.

When once the start was made, the transition was easy. From the writings of the so-called Apostolic Fathers, which gave the first indication—especially the epistles of Ignatius—to the uncompromising decrees of the Council of Trent, the whole tendency was to substitute the authority of Holy Church for that of Holy Writ. Less and less the moral element was recognized; more and more the intellectual was advanced, and made to depend upon the decisions of those who were pleased to call themselves the Church.

Tertullian's view was as confusing as his logic. Origen made the fact of the heresy depend on the size of the error held,—which makes one wonder by what manner of means the guilt could be measured. Jerome and Augustine both recognized the moral element; but Jerome's position was marred by his

usual vacillation and dread of heterodoxy, while Augustine continually confounded the authority of the Church with that of the Scriptures.

But the tendency was a welcome one in that age, and grew apace. At the very time that Augustine wrote there was living one who afterwards gave the watchword of rigid orthodoxy—Vincent of Lerius. In his Commonitorium (sec. 6) he wrote what may be accepted as the first frank recognition of the transition already unconsciously effected. "In the Catholic Church itself all possible care must be taken that we hold that faith which has been believed everywhere, always, by all"—"quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus," that impossible touchstone of true doctrine! How sad to think that he who supplied the rallying cry of orthodoxy should after all rest under the horrible suspicion of the semi-Pelagian heresy! Who is sufficient!

Passing rapidly over the intervening centuries, let us consider two statements that may be accepted as final. Abbé Bergier, in his dictionary of theology, defines "heresy" as "a voluntary and obstinate error, contrary to some dogma of faith." So far, good; but he goes on to say that the heresy is displayed by opposition to the authority of the Church which has been made the depository of faith and doctrine. Join to this the dictum of Trent: "A person is not to be called a heretic as soon as he errs in matters of faith; then only is he to be so called when, in defiance of the authority of the Church, he maintains impious opinions with unyielding pertinacity." Nowhere is the supereminent position of the Church set forth in more unmistakable terms. The transition is completed and fixed in the form of a dogma which justifies itself under the shadow of the all-protecting ægis of "quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus."

In the Reformation, the moral idea again connected itself with the conception of heresy. Conflict with the hierarchy naturally led to the laying of emphasis on the supremacy of the Scriptures. No man could be called a heretic, save one who defied God by disobedience to the word he had given for guidance. But the spirit of the times was too strong. The stress of controversy and earlier training led to a gradual change in the con-

ception. The *moral* factor retreated into the back-ground ever more and more, and the *formal* took its place. On the throne of the deposed Holy Church, systematized dogma was set to rule with a rod of iron. It was but a change of masters with nothing to choose between them for arbitrariness. A Luther might contend that heresy was "a spiritual thing," a Melanchthon deprecate the use of violence, but a Calvin represented more nearly the spirit of intolerance in his times, and so the usurper was legitimated on the territory of Protestantism.

Time has softened the rigor of that conflict. Toleration for divergence of thought has been granted in ever-increasing measure. Much that is now accepted, then received unlimited condemnation. The moral side of heresy has again asserted itself. But even yet there is confusion in the use of the term. In the literature on the subject the varying content of the word is a constant source of bewilderment. What then are we to take as a fair definition of "heresy"?

It will not be possible to take the scriptural use of the word as standard. Such a choice would be to abandon the discussion at once, and lose sight of the vast number of heresies that could not be classed under that conception. Hardly a heresy can be mentioned that began in pride of spirit, and was continued in conscious opposition to the truth. It will be necessary, rather, to take the term in the sense established by the use of centuries. Whether it be accurate or not, it is the only definition by which we may understand the heresies that fill the pages of ecclesiastical history. And, if an uncomfortable sense of its original meaning abide, it must be remembered that the blame arising from such a conception is not to be applied to heresies developed through mental activity alone. Heresy, then, is the holding of any doctrine or belief at variance with the recognized standard, or doctrinal system, of a religious body. This will apply to any heresy, whether voluntary or involuntary, which has manifested itself in the history of the Christian religion.

"In reading ecclesiastical history when I was an Anglican," says Newman in his Apologia, "it used to be forcibly brought home to me how the initial error of what afterwards became

heresy was the urging forward some truth, against the prohibition of authority, at an unseasonable time."* Not many outside the Roman Catholic Church would agree with the *use* Newman makes of this statement, but few indeed would find fault with the statement itself. Many names recur to which this would be applicable, but, among them all, none stands out with greater distinctness than that of Nestorius.

He had been called from Antioch to Constantinople to be bishop of that city. The place of his former service, his eloquence and his ascetic life, reminded the people of Chrysostom who had come to them thirty years before, and they congratulated themselves on obtaining another "golden mouth." His entrance into office was marked by great zeal for orthodoxy; and his first act was to obtain an imperial edict against the various heretical bodies then enjoying certain liberties in his diocese. All seemed propitious for Nestorius, and he could well be at ease in the midst of defeated rivals.

But his sky soon darkened. One of his presbyters, Anastasius—of the same school of thought as Nestorius—took exception to the use of the word "Theotokos" as applied to Mary. With more zeal than prudence he denounced it in unmeasured terms, urging that the unthinking use of it by the people was inimical to true doctrine. Complaint against the presbyter was immediately carried before Nestorius, who openly defended him in public service and pointed out the dishonor done to God by the common use of the term. At once there was division among the people and his rivals ranged themselves in the opposition.

To Nestorius the term expressed but a theological idea, and, as such, was accepted by him with certain modifications. To the people, however, it represented at the same time a mighty religious sentiment. Being closely connected with the growing veneration for Mary, it fell within the bounds of devotion that lies so close to the hearts of the people, and thus it touched the most violent passions. It was on these the enemies of Nestor-

*Apologia pro sua Vita, J. H. Newman, p. 259.

ius played, and soon the city was in an uproar, while every day but added intensity and territory to the tumult.

Nestorius had an enemy in Cyril of Alexandria. He was a worthy successor of the unscrupulous Theophilus and, like him, his chief ambition was to make Constantinople feel the power of Alexandria. That Nestorius was an Antiochian caused him to be hated with especial fervor, because of his predecessor, Chrysostom. It had not been so long before this that Cyril had been forced to retract Alexandria's condemnation of Chrysostom and the act had not been very pleasant. But now, in the difficulty that had overtaken Nestorius, Cyril saw the opportunity to heal his wounded pride, and entered into the controversy to humble his adversary. Not many weeks elapsed until it was seen that the only way to settle the vexed question was to assemble the bishops in an ecumenical council. The charges of heresy had become too pointed and violent on both sides to be disregarded.

It is not necessary to enter into the details of the plans by which Cyril effected his purpose. It is sufficient to know that when the Council met in Ephesus, he had enough partisans there to control the actions of the assembly. When Nestorius refused to appear before the Council at the summons of Cyril, because all the bishops invited had not yet appeared, his enemy caused him to be condemned unheard in the first day's session. The tools worked well in Cyril's hand. They duly praised his orthodoxy and were properly horrified at the impious wickedness of Nestorius. But the supreme moment came when, under skilful management, with a unanimity that showed previous instruction, all the bishops *shouted* together:* "Let him be anathema who does not anathematize Nestorius! The right faith anathematizes him! The Holy Synod anathematizes him! Let him be anathema who communicates with Nestorius! And we all anathematize the epistle and the dogmas of Nestorius! We all anathematize the heretic Nestorius! We

*Authoritative Christianity, Counc. of Eph., Act I., Jas. Chrystal, pp. 176–178.

all anathematize those who communicate with Nestorius! We anathematize the impious faith of Nestorius! We all anathematize the impious doctrine of Nestorius! We all anathematize the impious Nestorius! All the inhabited world anathematizes his impious religion! Let him be anathema who does not anathematize him! The right faith anathematizes him! The Holy Synod anathematizes him! Let him be anathema who communicates with Nestorius!"

The condemnation has been quoted in full to show the spirit of the assembly. The very iterance showed a vindictiveness far removed from the heart-sorrow over an erring brother avowed in this Synod, professedly guided by the Holy Spirit.

There was difficulty in having the sentence ratified at first, but Cyril was finally victorious. All the powerful friends of Nestorius, in court and church, deserted him, and he was driven into exile, branded for all the ages as a contumacious heretic. Yet, of what had he been guilty? His life had been pure, yet they overwhelmed him with calumnies. His zeal against heretics had been unquestioned,—but he did that to cover up his own heresy, his enemies said. "He asserted, indeed, and rightly, the duality of the natures, and the continued distinction between them; he denied, with equal correctness, that God, as such, could either be born, or suffer and die."* If his statements were heretical, it was because he was judged from the standpoint of an alien and rival school. If he "pressed the distinction of the two natures to double personality,"† his enemies drove him to that by the violence of their invective.

There could be no sympathy between the two schools. Only time could point out that the method of Alexandria was essentially wrong and the grammatico-historical method of Antioch the only true one. After many centuries the contention of Nestorius was justified. His substitution of "Christotokos" for "Theotokos" was acknowledged to be correct, and, to-day, Nestorius, the heresiarch, the schismatic, is vindicated in the minds of all unprejudiced students of history.

*Hist. of Christian Church, Schaff, Vol. III., p. 718.
†Ibid., I., p. 718.

But, when we turn our attention to the adversary of Nestorius, the wonder deepens. Cyril—court-politician, instigator of seditions, murderer of Hypatia!—to point the finger of accusation at Nestorius! He professed great sorrow over the danger threatening the true doctrine; yet every day he crucified it in his life. Bribery, under cover of the oriental custom of offering gifts, could gain him the victory, but the church of Alexandria had to mourn on account of the depths of poverty to which he brought it. It takes all the genius of a Hefele to defend this canonized saint from his own deeds, but, in the end, these very deeds hale him before the tribunal. And, in addition, when we study the Monophysite and Monothelite heresies, it is upon Cyril and his school that we must place the responsibility.

What has been said of Nestorius could, in great measure, be attributed to many others. Indeed, it gave Vincent of Lerins great concern that nearly all the heretics were men of pure, unselfish lives and great endowments; but he comforted himself by arguing that they must needs be dominated by an all-absorbing ambition from the moment they dared oppose Holy Church. But, passing rapidly by many who urge themselves upon our attention, let us come to one who is very familiar to us.

If there is any virtue in our definition, then Luther is the chief among heretics. His life, when once he was aroused, was one long opposition to accepted standards. It is not necessary to give the details of his struggle with the papacy. Let it suffice to note a few of the inconsistencies which his keen eye detected.

To one with the earnest and practical mind of Luther, nothing would be more apparent than the contrast between the teaching and the practice of the hierarchy. What was required of the people was totally disregarded by the clergy. Moreover, it was becoming evident that much of the disorder of Christendom had risen from the dogmas themselves, which the Church and the priests had forced upon the people. To see was to feel, and then to speak, and right vigorously Luther voiced his condemnation of the abuses. He had been taught that the Bible

was the inspired word of God, and that it was the Church's office to interpret it correctly. What he *saw* was the greatest possible contradiction between the standard and the practice. Where peace and humility were enjoined, pride and contention were displayed. Where purity and love should abound, giant lusts wielded the weapons of malignity and hate. And, when his protest was expressed, what a storm arose!

One is curious to know by what weighty arguments the priestly power set this sturdy objector right. Perhaps, the best expression of that will be found in the letter of Erasmus to the Archbishop of Mentz when excusing himself from attacking Luther.* "Certain divines that I know will neither set him right nor point out where he is wrong. They only howl and raise the mob upon him. They shout out 'heresy, heretic, heresiarch, schismatic, Antichrist,' and not a word besides; and their language is the more odious because most of them have never looked into his writings." It was the old summary custom. But, then, it was so comfortable and effective! No need of laborious study to refute him; to brand him as a heretic would be sufficient. It was so easy to be a heretic in those days!

There was another inconsistency that Luther noticed. It was between the clear, sublime thoughts of Holy Writ and the hair-splitting puerilities of the Schoolmen. It was their *duty* to set forth these truths in easier form for those less favored. Let Erasmus tell us what their *practice* was. His words are a comment on 1 Tim. 1 : 6, concerning vain disputations, as it appears in his edition of the Greek Testament.† "Is the proposition that God is a beetle or a pumpkin as probable antecedently as the proposition that God is man? * * The Schoolmen have been arguing for generations whether the proposition that Christ exists from eternity is correctly stated; whether he is compounded of two natures or consists of two natures; whether he is *conflatus*, or *commixtus*, or *conglutinatus*, or *coaugmentatus*, or *geminatus*, or *copulatus*. The present opinion is that not any of these participles is right, and we are to have a new word,

*Life and Letters of Erasmus, Froude, p. 124, 125.

†Life and Letters of Erasmus, Froude, p. 244.

unitus, which still is to explain nothing. * * * And all this stuff, of which we know nothing and are not required to know anything, they treat as the citadel of our faith."

It did no good to argue against such folly. The only reply of the doctors was to charge their opponent with heresy, and seek to overwhelm him with fresh thunderbolts from their arsenals. Definition was piled on definition; "conclusions, corollaries, propositions explicit and propositions implicit"* were hurled in battle array against him. As Erasmus said of them:† "The head of Jupiter was not so full of conundrums when he called for Vulcan with his axe to deliver him."

And, if an insolent rebel survived this, the powerful arm of the Church could effect silence.

There were many besides Luther who opposed the abuses of their times, and criticised the dogmas imposed upon them. The whole career of Erasmus was a continued protest against crying evils. "Heretic" was a common name for him among the clergy, and, so he told his friend, Lewis Ber,—he understood "how Arius and Tertullian and Wickliff were driven into schism by malicious clergy and wicked monks."‡ Colet of Oxford admitted privately that many things were generally taught which he did not believe, but he would not create scandal by blurting out his objections. No book could be so heretical but he would read it, and read it carefully."§ And, Erasmus declares, "he learnt more from such books than he learnt from dogmatism and interested orthodoxy."‖ Yet both these men died in the bosom of Holy Church, in "the odor of sanctity;" while Luther became the arch-heretic. His earnest appeals in behalf of orthodoxy brought him no other reward, and, day by day, he drifted farther and farther from the moorings appointed in the Church's harbor. His very nature compelled him to continue in his protests so long as the evils remained. The clergy might howl, the pope might thunder; but a clergy so debased, and a pope, of whom his staunchest admirer said,¶ "He would

*Encomium Moriae, Erasmus, p. 122. †Ibid, p. 133.
‡Life and Letters of Erasmus, Froude, p. 356. §Ibid, p. 100.
‖Ibid, p. 100. ¶Council of Trent, Froude, p. 27.

have been a perfect pope had he known, or cared anything for, religion," could not command the submission of one whose authority was seated in the Highest.

There is no need to continue. Many others besides Nestorius and Luther could be used as illustrations to enforce the argument, but they would hardly make it more conclusive. Indeed, one is almost forced at times, in the study of the heresies, to believe that the heretics alone were "unconscious" of anything but the desire to be true to what they believed; so often the orthodox party is marked by the spirit of prejudgment that determines to uphold the standard accepted at the time, no matter what may be proved against it. It may be said in extenuation of this course that it is due to the natural conservatism of human nature, which takes alarm at anything that touches the supernatural realm. True, but the uneasy sense of fear that accompanies it, together with the many injustices practised in thought, word and deed, show that orthodoxy, so-called, is often unsure of its own ground.

In the conflicts that occur, orthodoxy is generally successful for the time being. Only Time brings the relentless Nemesis that turns the brilliant victory into a shameful defeat. The staunch defender of "the right faith" is held up in his true character—what Milton calls "a heretic in the truth," since "he believes things only because * * the assembly so determines." The heretic is vindicated even in his error, because his spirit has been the spirit of Truth. He has seen in the teaching of the Church that which is inconsistent or doubtful or misleading, and he has honestly endeavored to set it right. Opposition has come, but he has the eternal persistence of Truth in his heart and cannot be daunted. The goal of perfection is before him and no obstacle can turn him from the way that leads to it.

So it will ever be. While a single doctrine remains in perplexing form will men arise to clear away the difficulties. Scorn, contumely, persecution, the ban of the Church, may be their lot; that will make no difference. As a wise theologian ventured to say at the Council of Trent: "Heresy can never be silenced by hurling anathemas at it. The way to get rid of

heresy is to tolerate differences of opinion. Thus, and in no other way, can men come to understand each other."* It will do no good to oppose the innovation in the spirit of hate. If it is true, it must conquer in any event; but the victory of truth should be in love. Nor will it serve the purpose to cling to the old confusion, in vain hope that the truth will sometime rise triumphantly out of it, and to oppose the unconscious spirit of heresy that seeks for higher truth, because it leads to error. The very tendency to extremes shows the vitality of the heresy. Whatever may be done in opposition, it must and will prevail. And, though its vision clothe the truth with error, yet, as Bacon says: "Truth emerges from error sooner than from confusion."

ARTICLE VIII.

ORIENTAL ARCHÆOLOGY AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.

By Rev. Junius B. Fox, Ph. D.

During the last half century a new world has been opened before us by the explorers, excavators, and decipherers of the ancient monuments of the East. The recent researches of eminent archaeologists, philologists and historians, not only as private enterprises, but under governmental direction and university expeditions, have resurrected from their long-forgotten graves the great civilizations of the past and we are brought face to face with their wonderfully surprising and revolutionizing revelations. Leading specialists of Germany, England, France and America, during the last decenniums, have been ardently engaged in studying, arranging and illustrating the results of the new science, particularly in their relation to the Old Testament Literature. Representative American scholars, as McCurdy, Bliss, Ward, Hilprecht, and others, have not only eagerly watched the results of the discoveries in Egypt and Babylonia, Palestine, Arabia, Assyria and Asia Minor, but themselves rank among the foremost specialists on both continents. The en-

*Council of Trent, Froude, p. 223.

thusiasm displayed by these eminent scholars, stimulated doubtless by the arrogant assumptions of the "Higher Criticism," is continually spreading to an ever-widening circle of less prominent theologians and educated laymen. Dr. Fritz Hommel, the distinguished Professor of Semitic Languages at the University of Munich, recently wrote: "I look forward to the time when every enlightened reader of the Bible will be something of an archaeologist: in England and America this is much more generally the case than in Germany, a fact which is proved by the large circulation attained by popular scientific works on Assyriology and the literature of the Old Testament." (The Ancient Hebrew Tradition, Pref. p. VIII.) Perhaps not a few of our clergy and thoughtful laymen have read the magnificent works of Sayce, Maspero, Hommel, Bissell, and the first volume edited by Hilprecht publishing the results of the Babylonian expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, and others of the numberless books, periodicals and magazines in the department of Biblical Archaeology. A larger circle of readers have read the recent series of articles in *The Sunday-School Times*, and the archaeological department of the *Homiletic Review*. An interest, so widely prevalent and diffused, ought to guarantee a thorough discussion of this subject and a patient investigation by those who have not yet undertaken it.

Assyriology is the latest offspring of Archaeology and Philology. The land of its nativity is Western Asia, amid the ruins of Assyria, Babylonia, Nineveh and Khorsabad, while it has been nourished and brought to its present development in the quiet studies of European and American scholars. The almost unexampled swiftness which has characterized its growth has awakened suspicions of an ominous precocity, and they have not been altogether without foundation. Enthusiasts and devotees, impelled more by personal ambition than love of the truth, have become enamored of the fascinating charms of this youngest daughter of science, and unconsciously fallen into extravagances of admiration and errors of understanding wholly unwarranted by the facts. Either as excavators in the marshes of Mesopotamia, or as decipherers of the cuneiform documents

there unearthed by the spade of the explorer, or elaborating fictitious theories and hypothetic conjectures from imperfect and second-hand information, certain young thinkers especially, "hungry for fresh distinction," have become disciples of the archaeological masters to gain a cheap notoriety for themselves, regardless of the consequences for God's kingdom and his righteousness.

The irrefutable achievements and deductions of the great specialists in this department are, however, surprising in extent and apparently incontrovertible in fact. Men of indisputable character and scholarship, with the commission of great centers of learning as their authority, and "counting not their own lives dear unto themselves," have braved the perils of the sea, robbers, and savages relying only upon God for protection, to uncover the light imprisoned in the storm-beaten walls of forgotten temples and buried palaces of a primitive, long-forgotten world.

The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, costing, to date, about seventy thousand dollars for the excavation in the vicinity of Nuffar, has recovered over thirty-two thousand cuneiform tablets, many of which have an antiquity of 2800 years B. C. "Of the manifold character of these documents— syllabaries, letters, chronological lists, historical fragments, astronomical and religious texts, inscriptions referring to buildings, votive tablets, dedications, inventories, contracts, etc.—nothing less than an exhaustive examination can give a clear idea." (Research in Bible Lands, p. 60.) The classification and editing of these important results have been entrusted to Doctor Hilprecht, the Assyriologist of the expedition, who has planned their publication in four series of from ten to fifteen volumes each. In this encyclopedia of Oriental Archaeology there will be illustrations and descriptions of the multifarious results of this pre-eminently important expedition. Hundreds of inscribed bricks, door sockets, marble vases, and clay stamps for bricks, and especially the inscribed sacrificial vessels and votive objects belonging to the kings of the oldest

dynasties of Ur and Erech, hitherto unknown; clay sarcophagi, seals and seal cylinders, clay bowls, enameled and plain vases, playthings, weapons, weights, gold and silver ornaments, objects in stone, bronze and iron, ancient intaglios and bas-reliefs, with a collection of human skulls, will all doubtless be described in this superb and anxiously awaited publication.

In addition to these American discoveries, excavations have been conducted by the French in a group of mounds under the name of Tello, in Southern Babylonia, of which Mr. de Sarzee was, and is still, the director; by the Turkish government, under the protectorate of the present Sultan, amid the ruins of Abu-Habba; by the greatest English archaeologists, especially the renowned Sayce, in Egypt, and particularly at the village of Tel-el-Amarna, on the eastern bank of the Nile, midway between the towns of Minieh and Assiout; in Arabia by the indefatigable Dr. Edward Glaser; in Palestine and other lands of the Orient. The dreary solitudes that long brooded over these buried civilizations have begun to disappear before the labors of dauntless and indefatigable explorers, and a literature, almost overwhelming in extent, graven in clay and stone, transports us back to the very cradle of the race. They reveal a perfection of art, a marvelousness of correspondence, a development of civilization in those primeval days that excite the wonder and admiration of our more enlightened age. Schools and libraries must have existed everywhere; clay books were stored in the cities; letters of every description were exchanged on every subject; and, judging from the tablets of Tel-el-Amarna, Canaan was a center of correspondence, even before the age of the Exodus. The objection of the "higher critics" that Moses could not have written the Pentateuch because the art of writing was unknown in his day falls, therefore, hopelessly to the ground.

Let us now examine what bearing the results of archaeology has upon the literature of the Old Testament.

The monumental remains of the tribes and nations contemporaneous with Israel and the Patriarchs afford us a secondary revelation to that embodied in the Hebrew Scriptures. It is the province of Oriental Archaeology to deal with the peoples,

countries, and languages of the Bible so as to exhibit their true relations to Bible teaching. As auxiliary to the Old Testament history, and as illustrating its literature, archaeological facts, properly interpreted, are richly supplementary to what is material in the revelation of God, apart from what is spiritual and ideal. While the monuments can not be said to "confirm" the historical accuracy of the Old Testament, they are a most important illustration of the method of its composition. Some of the theories advanced, and the facts unquestionably established, seem subversive of traditional ideas and pre-existing conceptions of inspiration, but nothing has yet been produced that seriously affects the integrity, authenticity or authority of Divine Revelation. If it can be proven, according to Sayce, that, "the historical books of the Old Testament in their present form are compilations of comparatively late date," which seems more and more improbable as the results of the discoveries are investigated, nevertheless the impregnable foundation remains, that, whatever the sources of information available to the inspired writers, they were unerringly guided by the Holy Ghost. When, for instance, it is claimed that the Sabbath and week of seven days had its first home in Babylon, or the narrative of the creation is ultimately of Babylonian origin, there is nothing in these statements inconsistent with a belief in a Primitive Revelation. The great similarity between the Babylonian and Hebrew accounts of the Creation, Deluge, etc., may be evidence of a common kinship but not of a conscious borrowing.

Moreover the truth is never ashamed nor afraid to face facts. It invites investigation and critical examination. We heartily concur in the words of the Archbishop of Canterbury, who is the reputed author of the recent encyclical issued by the Fourth Lambeth Conference. He says: "The critical study of the Bible by competent scholars is essential to the maintenance in the church of a healthy faith. That faith is already in serious danger which refuses to face questions that may be raised either on the authority or the genuineness of the Scriptures that have come down to us. Such refusal creates painful suspicion in the minds of men, whom we have to teach, and will weaken the

strength of our own conviction of the truth that God has revealed to us. A faith which is always or often attended by a secret fear that we dare not inquire lest inquiry should lead us to results inconsistent with what we believe, is already infected with a disease which may soon destroy it. But all inquiry is attended with a danger, on the other side, unless it be protected by the guard of reverence, confidence and patience." (*Literary Digest*, Sept. 4, 1897). Then, too, the facts brought to light by Archaeology are everywhere promulgated in the current literature of the day; archaeological research and study are the latest literary *fad;* and sooner or later every earnest reader of the Bible must be brought to face the theories and facts and to formulate some sort of interpretation of them. It is a timid faith indeed that shrinks from the statement of the latest conclusions of the archaeologist, however astounding or radical they appear in the presence of previous traditional opinions.

Before proceeding to set forth some of the claims of the archaeologists in reference to the origin of the Old Testament it is well to mention the four different main "sources" of the oldest inspired writings. There is, first of all, the so-called "Priestly Code," which includes the greater part of the law in Leviticus and Numbers, and the detailed description of the Tabernacle in Exodus; the account of the Creation in Genesis I, the genealogies in Genesis V, and several passages in the history of the patriarchs, etc. Two other sources of a more popular nature are also recognized: One of these is called the "Jehovistic," in which God is always called Yahveh or Jehovah. To this belongs the account of the Creation in Genesis II, the story of Paradise and the Fall, that of the Tower of Babel, and, in short, everything in the nature of popular narrative. The other popular source runs parallel with the Jehovistic, from the time of the Patriarchs to the history of the Exodus and the conquest of Canaan. This is the *Elohistic*, which derives its designation from the older form of the divine name. The fourth source is Deuteronomy, or the fifth Book of Moses, which some of the "higher critics" claim to be a pious forgery in the time of the Kings, most probably Josiah.

But it is the contention of some of the greatest Oriental Archaeologists that these "sources" of the Old Testament are not original in themselves, but are derived from foreexisting documents, and even traditions of nations contemporaneous with Israel, or antedating its origin. Even so eminent a man as Sayce, of Oxford, who disclaims belonging to the school of the higher critics, attempts to prove the Babylonian Canaanitish and Egyptian elements in the Book of Genesis, demonstrates the Egyptian tutelage of Israel, and makes the historical books of the Old Testament the works of Biblical compilers. "The facts contained in them are trustworthy, and have been honestly copied from older and in many cases contemporaneous documents; it is only their setting and framework, the order in which they are arranged, and the links of connection by which they are bound together that belong to the later compiler." (The Higher Criticism and the Monuments, p. 409).

In this scholarly volume portions of an Assyrian epic of the Creation, first brought to light by Mr. George Smith, are quoted at length, and the resemblances and differences between the Biblical and Babylonian accounts are fully set forth. The author contends that these cosmological accounts are two strikingly alike to be purely accidental. The resemblances extend even to words. From the discoveries made in Babylonia and at Tel-el-Amárna, we have learnt how deep and lasting was the influence of Babylonian culture and literature upon pre Israelitish Canaan. The Biblical compiler, it is claimed, was acquainted, either directly or indirectly, with the Assyrian and Babylonian traditions. At the same time, the Biblical narrative is stripped of all that was distinctively Babylonian and polytheistic, and becomes a sober narrative, breathing a spirit of the purest and most exalted monotheism. The coincidence, too, is remarkable that in the Assyrian epic of the creation there are two accounts, corresponding to the Biblical "Elohistic" and "Jehovistic" accounts, and these similarities are fully exhibited by Sayce. Judging from the cuneiform inscriptions even the creation scenery is Babylonian. The names of Eden, and of the rivers were derived from the language of Babylonia. The names of the cherubim

who guarded the tree of life and of the trees themselves have the same origin. Even the "mist that went up from the land and watered the whole face of the ground," the dust of the ground out of which man was formed, and the very names "Adam" and "Eve" have their Babylonian counterparts and analogies. The same thesis is advanced in connection with the story of the Deluge, "the ethnological table" in Genesis x, the Tower of Babel, Genesis xiv, etc. While archaeology has reclaimed Nimrod from the region of myth, into which he had been relegated by the higher criticism, still "the accounts of the Creation and the Flood, moreover, have shown us that Babylonian documents underlie alike the Elohistic and Jehovistic narratives. It is only in the treatment of them that the narratives differ from one another." (Sayce's Higher Criticism and the Monuments, p. 172).

In another chapter of this great book, which the author writes as an Archaeologist and not as a Theologian, there is a presentation of the so called Canaanitish and Egyptian Elements in the Book of Genesis. Among the many surprises which the Tel-el-Amarna tablets had in store for us was the discovery that after all Melchizedek might well have been a historical personage. The story of this mysterious man, "without father and without mother," is "derived from the old clay records of Jerusalem that made their way into the pages of Genesis through the distorting medium of tradition." The stories of Abraham and Sarah, their migrations in Canaan, the accounts of the other patriarchs and the residence of the Israelites in Egypt have their sources largely in Palestinian, Babylonian, Edomite and Egyptian documents. In a similar way the whole history and development of the Israelitish nation are treated and their roots fastened in the contemporaneous documents of other nations. Such are the conclusions of a few of the specialists in the department of archaeological research, and they can only be successfully refuted by original study of the documents themselves with equal skill in deciphering and interpreting them.

It is true that in many instances the facts are still so imperfectly known as to make the conclusions drawn from them prob-

able only. It is also true that a conclusion which seems certain and evident to one student may not seem equally certain and evident to another. "In all departments of study, more especially in history and archaeology, there are certain groups of facts which admit of more than one explanation." Hypotheses confidently advanced and enthusiastically supported, especially in the empiric stage of science, are frequently superseded by a series of theories before one is discovered to explain the facts. Bryce in his "American Commonwealth" says, that, upon his return to England he pitched overboard half his first theories of the American life and government.

Our tardiness in accepting the advanced views of even the greatest archaeologists is amply justified by their own concessions and more carefully revised opinions. In a recent issue of *The Young Man*, Prof. Sayce is quoted as saying: "I have come to disbelieve thoroughly in the so called critical view of the composition of the Pentateuch. I believe that substantially it is the work of the Mosaic age, and of Moses himself." Doubtless his views may have undergone a similar change, upon further study and investigation, in regard to the origin of other Old Testament writings. The records upon which these claims are founded are very imperfect and fragmentary. Enthusiastic scholars, working in the nebulous atmosphere of uncertainty, may too readily interpret facts in the light of preconceived theories and conjectures. A good deal of the historical criticism which has been passed upon the Old Testament is criticism which seems to imagine that the compilers of the Old Testament books were German scholars, surrounded by the volumes of their libraries, and writing in awe of the reviewers.

It will not do, however, to brush aside all the facts of Archaeology, as untrustworthy or as baseless assumptions. Many of its statements are proven, while some are self-evident. The monuments, when their dates are accurately ascertained, furnish an important supplementary evidence that at least some portions of the Hebrew Scriptures are foreshadowed by extra-Israelitish traditions though they are not copied from them. Such demonstrations do not at all overthrow the Old Testament as the in-

spired word of God, while such a catastrophe may be the fate of the old traditional opinion of verbal inspiration.

Considered altogether, the discoveries and results of archaeology are unfavorable to the assumptions and pretensions of the higher, negative or modern destructive criticism of the Old Testament, which has strenuously attempted to remand the composition of the books to later dates and authors than those to whom they have been generally referred. "That primary assumption of the late use of writing for literary purposes in Palestine, which, consciously or unconsciously, has done so much to wreck the belief of the critic in the early narratives of the Bible, has been shown to be utterly false. The cuneiform inscriptions have restored the historical credit of certain passages of the Pentateuch which had been resolved into myth, and have demonstrated the worthlessness of the arguments by which their mythic character had been maintained. The archaeology of Genesis seems to show that the literary analysis of the book must be revised, and that the confidence with which one portion of a verse is assigned to one author and another portion of it to another is a confidence begotten of the study of modern critical literature and not of the literature of the past. Such microscopic analysis is the result of short sight." (Sayce's Higher Criticism and the Monuments, p. 561.)

Not only the monuments, which have proven such richly supplementary evidence of the correctness of Old Testament chronology and history, but the internal evidence of the writings themselves and their common sense interpretation demonstrate the preposterous pretensions of this arrogant type of criticism. Look, for instance, at the Deuteronomic legislation, making a definite and repeated claim to be Mosaic, and which our critics hold to be a product of King Josiah's time. It prescribes laws which would be utterly senseless as productions of this later period. The order, for example, is given to Israel, after their settlement in Canaan to wipe out Amelek, and not to forget it; when, in the time of Josiah, Amelek had already long since wholly disappeared from history. "They are also commanded to destroy the Canaanites who had then ceased to be of any

importance whatever. A law is made against Ammon and Moab, and in favor of Edom, which exactly reverses the real relations of these peoples to Israel in the time of Josiah. Directions are given for choosing a king, it being assumed that they have none, several hundred years after the anointing of Saul. An organization of the Israelitish army is presupposed, wholly out of place in the days of kingly authority. Mourning customs are forbidden, clearly allowed and practiced in the time of Josiah and later; which, whatever else it may prove, is entirely inconsistent with the theory that Deuteronomy originated in his day. To say of these laws that they are a part of the fictitious coloring given by the writer to his work that it might seem Mosaic is to make of the deception a monstrosity, to no one more embarrassing than to the critics themselves." (Bissell's Pentateuch: Its Origin and Structure, p. 18.)

It is hardly a surprise that all this hypothesis of pious fraud on the part of the imaginative post-exilian writers should be completely overturned and annihilated by the discoveries in Egyptology and Assyriology. The theory that presupposes that the Hebrew Scriptures are little more than a tissue of fabrications finds no support from archaeology but its most overwhelming refutation. The literature already unearthed by the explorers and excavators in Bible lands exceeds in compass the whole of the Old Testament, and the cuneiform texts discovered in Egypt and Assyria alone are estimated to fill five hundred octavo volumes.

In the face of this extensive monumental literature there is nothing that has affected the integrity of the Old Testament as God's primitive revelation, nor anything that has invalidated its authenticity as the inspired word of God. At the same time, many of the conclusions of the older school of commentators and apologists have undergone modification or been entirely rejected because they are not supported by the indisputable evidence of the monuments. As Schmauk observes in his excellent little book on *The Higher Criticism*, p. 216: "The negative theory ignored the results of Egyptian and Assyrian research at first,

and now reluctantly admits them, as far as they do not clash with the preconceived premises, fundamental to the existence of the negative theory." The striking analogies between the Biblical narratives and those of contemporaneous nations, as deciphered from the monuments, are no indications whatever that either of the accounts are copies of the others. All depends upon the dates of both, and the great preponderance of evidence shows an equal antiquity in the language, history, and literature of Israel with that of any other nation.

In confirmation of this now generally accepted fact, Dr. Fritz Hommel has recently published a work in which he exhaustively compares the Hebrew personal names with the contemporary names of similar formation among the surrounding nations, and proves, from the contemporary inscriptions, their existence in the ages of Abram and Moses, and the impossibility of a later post-exilian invention. This celebrated work by the Professor of Semitic languages in the University of Munich entitles him to a place among the foremost Philologists and Assyriologists of the age. (See *The Ancient Hebrew Tradition as Illustrated by the Monuments*, p. 350, New York, E. and J. B. Young & Co). Hommel deals with the cardinal question of the dates themselves, upon which the issue with the higher critics hangs, and by an irresistible array of philological and archæological evidence establishes the contemporaneous existence of the Old Testament records with the events they described.

The arguments and subject-matter of Hommel's remarkable book are too abstruse and compact to admit of any recapitulation within the necessary limits of this article, but the result of his over-mastering researches and studies may be given in his own language: "In conclusion, let us consider, for a moment, the practical effect of all the evidence from the Tel-el-Amarna tablets—dating from the period 1430 and 1400 B. C.—and from the Minaean and Egyptian inscriptions. Far from obliging us to modify in any way the traditional view of Old Testament history, or from placing a weapon in the hands of its opponents, it tends on the contrary, to confirm—indirectly it is true—the accuracy of the Old Testament narrative, and at the

same time fill up a gap in it, by enabling us to reconstruct the history of the period which preceded the conquest of Palestine by Joshua, about the year 1230 B. C.

The ancient Hebrew tradition—and more especially that part of it which deals with the earliest times—has, in many instances, come down to us in a merely fragmentary and mutilated condition. But even isolated references and allusions, such as those which occur in regard to the land of Ashur, Heber and Malki-el, Hebron, etc., etc., when supplemented by the external evidence that lies at our hand, are shown to be ancient and authentic tradition, and thus supply further testimony to the existence of *pre-Mosaic* records." (The Ancient Hebrew Tradition, pp. 266–267). There is evidently not much comfort in this opinion of one of the world's greatest Assyriologists for the latter-day *post-exilian* theorists.

There is an increasing vigorous reaction against the Wellhausen school of higher critics. It has lately received some fatal blows from such men as Klostermann of Europe, and Professor Green, of the University of Princeton. The latter eminent scholar has lately sent forth a comprehensive volume, (*The Unity of the Book of Genesis*), with the aim of entirely disproving the alleged existence of different sources in the Pentateuch, and calling attention with pitiless logic to the numerous weak points—the "hair-splitting and atom-dividing" efforts—of the so-called modern critics. It is unquestionable that these microscopic destructionists have gone virtually bankrupt in their attempt to unravel, not only chapter by chapter, but verse by verse, and clause by clause, the web in which the different reputed sources are entangled, arguing frequently from premises which are entirely false.

The results of oriental Archaeology and their bearing upon the Old Testament writings should be welcomed, rather than despised. They are a test of the truthfulness and credibility of the narratives that have been transmitted to us from those primitive ages. "They too bring before our view a civilized and cultured society; they too tell us of cities and kingdoms and empires, and of the intercourse that went on between them.

The Egypt and Canaan they describe are, it is true, the civilized Egypt and Canaan of later times; but they are also the civilized Egypt and Canaan which the monuments now assure us already existed in the patriarchal age. The features of the civilization presupposed by the Book of Genesis are not borrowed from the period of the kings or of Babylonian exile; the Egyptian monuments have proved that they belong to the age of the patriarchs themselves." (Sayce on Research in Egypt, edited by Hilprecht, p. 111).

In many ways the cuneiform records of the East are valuable illustrations and supplements of the ancient Hebrew literature. Some of them have been indicated in articles by Professor J. F. McCurdy and others in the *Sunday School Times* and other current publications. The standing review of this department of study in the *Homiletic Review* conducted by Dr. William Hayes Ward, entitled "Light on Scriptural Texts from Recent Discoveries," ought to keep every intelligent pastor at least in touch with the subject. The facts of Biblical Archaeology and their relation to the Old Testament ought to be so generally diffused as to become a part of every man's store of knowledge. Those who have carefully examined these facts will find that the following are some of the points in which archaeological research has rendered important service in promoting a better understanding of the Old Testament.

We have a fuller comprehension of the extent of the Deluge, and the meaning of the geographical distribution of the human race in Genesis x. The fourteenth chapter, giving the account of Abraham's repulse of the eastern confederacy headed by the Elamites, is now intelligible; even the leaders of the invasion and their motives are explained by the monumental inscriptions. That most remarkable nation, the Hittites, has found a new history in the subterranean chambers of Palestine and Asia Minor. The Book of Kings has a wonderfully surprising explanation. The interaction between the Palestinian states and the great empires of Babylonia and Assyria has been fully exhibited from the cuneiform records of those ages. The relations between the Northern Kingdom of Israel with that of Damascus are set

in the clearest light. "Ahab, in the singular alliance of Benhadad II, appears as a member of the league of the western principalities, against the invasion of Shalmaneser II of Assyria. Their defeat in 854 gives us the first sure date in Biblical chronology,—a point of time from which we reckon back to David, Saul, and Samuel." (Recent Research in Bible Lands, pp. 22–23).

From the monuments we learn how Jehu, fierce and tyrannical, became a fawning suppliant to Shalmaneser; and how, a century later, Ahab of Judah invoked the protection of Tiglathpileser III, against the alliance of Damascus and Syria. Assyriology has here furnished us with the master key to the whole political history of the ancient East in this eventful period of Jewish history.

At the same time the principal epochs in the history of Judah receive an additional illumination. The contests of its Kings, the victories and defeats of its armies, its alliance with disaffected states against the mightier empires, its revolts against oppressors, all receive from the inscriptions an ample illumination. In these indestructible records of contemporaneous nations the mysterious silence of the Scriptures is broken, its necessary gaps filled in, its history and chronology vindicated and established. The wonderful guidance of God over his chosen people in their apostasies and wanderings, their pathway of light among the nations, is traced in these cuneiform records, while the written revelation finds its counterpart and supplement in that imperishable history engraved in stone.

Moreover, archaeological study has contributed in no small degree to our ever-increasing knowledge of the manners, customs and institutions of the Hebrew nation in the days of its existence as the peculiar people of God. The Biblical language and distinctive phrases of the inner life of the people gather a new light and meaning, under the almost magic touch of archaeology, as the spade of the excavator disentombs the civilizations of the past, and makes long-silent voices live again. It is the high and peculiar function of Philology and Archaeology to restore something of the native power and beauty to the words

which "holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

The monuments are the complements of the history and prophecy of Israel, and serve to exhibit and amplify the lessons taught by both. The vast field in which these treasures are stored can not be neglected or ignored by any who seek to be intelligent or well-informed, or, more than all, to have a wider comprehension of the truth of inspiration. Nothing can be gained by ignoring facts, which have already been rendered ubiquitous by the almost omniscient eye of the newsmonger and publisher. It will not do to sneer at the archaeologists as critical, or credulous, or untrustworthy philologists. Sooner or later, facts have a way of revenging themselves, and the facts of oriental archaeology are no exception to the rule.

Really, archaeology itself has nothing to do with theology or the Holy Scriptures. The discoveries of the Klondyke have nothing to do with questions of currency or monetary legislation. Empiricists can not decide upon theories of the rationalists, nor upon the dogmas of theologians, though they sometimes attempt to do so. The archaeologist interprets the discoveries and writes for the historian, not for the homilist or the the defender of the Bible. The facts he deals with are historical, and are to be judged like all other historical facts in accordance with the canons of historical reasoning.

The churchmen of the middle ages might have as well forbidden Galileo to use his telescope and condemn him to the horrors of the Inquisition as we to pour out our maledictions upon the archaeologists or take on a supercilious air when their work is mentioned.

From all that has been discovered and published on the subject, the records of the Old Testament have not been seriously affected by the comparison with the records of the monuments, but have rather received a most valuable vindication. This is nothing more than a confident and courageous faith in the providence and power of God can ever anticipate. He that "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the whole earth, and hath determined the times before appointed,

and the bounds of their habitation," though he left them for awhile "to walk in their own ways," has surely so guided and disposed all the events of human history and progress that his word of truth shall stand as the imperishable rock, against the assaults of Satan and the wicked devices of men, and overcome all at last and remain overwhelmingly triumphant. An absolute faith,—which alone becomes a true child of God,—can challenge any scrutiny or examination of the word of God, and stand unmoved by the slightest apprehension.

ARTICLE IX.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

Later Gleanings. A new series of Gleanings of Past Years. By the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone. pp. 426. $1.25.

These later gleanings embrace a number of well-known papers, theological and ecclesiastical, with which the "Grand Old Man" has favored the Christian public during the last twelve years. Their sweep reaches from "The Dawn of Creation" to the question of "The Validity of Angelican Orders," including such memorable monographs as "Robert Elsemere," "True and False Conceptions of the Atonement," "The Swine Miracle," "The Church under Henry VIII.," etc., etc.

The range is probably too large for any one writer, whatever his versatility. With all his vigor of thought, force of logic and charm of rhetoric, Mr. Gladstone after all impresses the studious reader with the fact that he is not a specialist. He has grand weapons in his common sense and in his firm faith in the Scriptures. Yet it may be questioned whether he does effective battle with giants who are recognized masters in their special domain. As Luther used to say, some questions should be reserved for the doctors.

Nevertheless these papers are not only entertaining, but they offer a very solid sort of mental and moral diet, and their presentation in this permanent form will be welcomed by multitudes of the thinking world.

E. J. W.

A History of the Hebrew People from the Division of the Kingdom to the Fall of Jerusalem in 586 B. C. By Charles Foster Kent, Ph. D. With Maps and Chart. pp. 218. $1.25.

A notice of volume I, of this admirable History of the Hebrew People appeared in these pages one year ago. Vol. II sustains the high

appreciation which that one called forth. Pitched on the views of the modern critical school, and occupied not so much with negative problems as with the positive results of criticism, on which there is substantial agreement among the scholars, it presents these in a simple, lucid style which adapts the work to the ordinary Sunday School Teacher and Bible Student, as well as to the more favored members of College and Seminary classes to whom it will be largely assigned as a text-book.

E. J. W.

A Concordance to the Greek Testament, according to the Texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf and the English Revisers. Edited by Rev. F. W. Moulton, M. A., D. D., and Rev. A. S. Geden. Square Royal 8vo. pp. 1037. $7.00

One of the noblest endeavors of Christian scholarship in the present century has been the laborious effort to secure an approximately pure text of the New Testament. The text of Westcott and Hort is now generally accepted as registering the results of criticism and as most worthy of confidence, and it is for this text, including references to the eighth edition of Tischendorf and that of the English revisers, that we have here a complete Concordance. The work accordingly differs from and supersedes all its predecessors in this, that they were intended solely for the Textus Receptus, while the present work is directed to the text of the Greek Testament as exhibited in the three modern critical editions.

Even marginal readings have in all cases been included. Accordingly no word or phrase which finds a place in any of these editions is excluded from this Concordance; nothing which is absent from them is present here. The method employed precludes the omission of any expression which, by even a remote probability, might be regarded as forming part of the true text of the New Testament, while passages disappear, as to the spuriousness of which there is practical unanimity among scholars. By the use of asterisks it is indicated whether words are met with or not in the Septuagint or other Greek versions of the Old Testament, including the Apocrypha, while the dagger denotes that as far as available information goes the word in question does not occur in Greek writers ealier than the Christian era. Citations are generally long enough to show in what construction a word occurs, and the original Hebrew is presented immediately under the Greek.

The plan of the work and the execution of it leave nothing to be desired. It is a magnificent addition to the equipment of Biblical Students. It not only places at their command an immediate reference to the most trustworthy text of every verse of the New Testament, but it supplies them with the very best aid of interpreting the New Testament Scriptures. Incomparably better than any extant commentary is the method which interprets Scripture by Scripture, the more obscure passages by the help of the more luminous ones, words and phrases of

doubtful meaning in one connection by their self-evident sense when they appear in another connection, and for this purpose this concordance is indispensable and invaluable. E. J. W.

The Bible and Islam, or The Influence of the Old and New Testaments on the Religion of Mohammed. By Henry Preserved Smith, D. D. pp. 319. $1.50.

This volume is the Ely Lectures for 1897, the series in which "Christianity and Positivism" by Dr. McCosh and "The Divine Origin of Christianity Indicated by its Historical Effects" by Dr. Storrs, appears. The author is Dr. Smith of Lane Seminary fame. The book is a study of Islam. It was the author's purpose to discover, in so far as possible, the forces which have made Islam. He approached his task with warm admiration for Mohammed and certainly the Prophet of Allah could ask for no fairer judge of his life and his work. The author finds in Mohammed a deeply religious nature, susceptible to the truths of Christianity with which he came in contact in Arabia in the seventh century. The type of Christianity was that of primitive Ebionism. The fact that Mohammed took so large a part of his material from the Old Testament does not disprove its Christian sources. His description of Judgment shows features which could have been borrowed only from the Gospel account. He recognized Jesus as one of the chief prophets. He seemed to have a deep appreciation of the spiritual truths of Christianity; but her distinctive doctrines he was utterly incapable of assimilating,—the doctrine of the Trinity, the Sonship of Christ, the Incarnation, the Atonement, etc. The excellence of Islam is thoroughly indicated by the author. He recognizes also the tenacity with which Islam clings to the past, but he believes that the religious capacity of Islam will yet open to the higher truth which we enjoy.

H. C. A.

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE COMPANY, NEW YORK.

The Psalter and Canticles. Pointed for Chanting to the Gregorian Psalm Tones, for the use of Evangelical Lutheran Congregations. Edited by Harry G. Archer and Rev. Luther D. Reed, with an introduction by Rev. D. H. Geissinger, D. D. 6½ x 8⅛. pp. 476. Cloth. $1.25.

Mr. Archer is the organist of the First Church, Pittsburg, Pa Mr. Reed is pastor of Emanuel Church, Allegheny, Pa. The work has been prepared for the use of Lutheran congregations. The editors give an interesting account, in the preface, of Ancient Plain Song, and of the Psalm Tones, in their use in the Church from very ancient time. Dr. Geissinger, in the introduction, says, "This work claims to reproduce the oldest and finest form of worship music. The melodies to which the entire Psalter is here arranged have strong claims to an antiquity long

antedating the Christian Church in her New Testament form. * * * They are our legitimate inheritance together with the Psalms themselves."

What is here attempted is new and we have no basis on which to estimate the value of the work. However, as all that the editors ask for their book is a fair trial, we cordially commend it to our musicians.

H. C. A.

WOLCOTT AND WEST, SYRACUSE, N. Y.

Crucifixion. By John H. Osborne. pp. 85. 60 cents.

We do not feel that we can endorse Mr. Osborne's views on the crucifixion and death of Christ, and our lack of familiarity with the details of the Roman method of crucifixion, as presented by the author, disqualifies us for criticism of that portion of the book, which, as a whole, seems to have no *raison d'être.* H. C. A.

EATON AND MAINS, NEW YORK.

The Librarian of the Sunday School. By Elizabeth Louisa Foote, A. B., B. L. S. pp. 86. 35 cents.

This is an excellent little manual for use in Sunday School libraries, and we should be glad to see the suggestions it gives put into general practice. H. C. A.

The Greater Gospel. By John M. Bamford. pp. 159. 50 cents.

Under the title of "The Greater Gospel," Mr. Bamford gives an account of four meetings in a city church during the course of which the minister asks some questions concerning the spiritual life, and is answered by "testimony" from several persons supposed to represent the different phases of society. Some pages are readable, but, as a whole, the treatment is so commonplace and inartistic as to rob the book of both interest and literary value. H. C. A.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Philip Jacob Spener: Augustus Harmann Francke. By Marie E. Richard. Cloth, pp. 154. 40 cents.

This is the first of THE LUTHERAN HAND-BOOK SERIES, which is announced to be a series of short, popular biographies of distinguished Lutherans, brief manuals of Lutheran history, Lutheran life and benevolent work. The Publication Society is to be congratulated upon sending out as a forerunner of these little books so worthy a volume as this. Spener and Francke are household words in Lutheran homes; Spener, the man of thought, Francke, the man of faith. The former roused the Church from spiritual death; the latter incited her to good works. The story of each is told in a delightful way, marked by fine discrimination of character. The author has given a valuable analysis of the Pietistic Movement in Chapter VI. Part I. H. C. A.

The Country Charge. By Marie E. Richard. pp. 208. 75 cents.

This little book is the story of a young clergyman who, after having received what in this country would be considered a good preparation for a scholarly career, decides to accept the small country charge of Sandown, in order, as he candidly admits, that he may have half his time for study and so more thoroughly prepare himself "to serve the Church with accurate and broad scholarship." He thinks of the work there merely as something to be done while he is fitting himself for his life-work. But with the first Sunday in the country charge comes the revelation which makes a new man of him,—namely, the realization that *that* is the Master's work; that *he* has been *called* to do it; and that no attainments of scholarship could yield the joy he would experience in leading these simple people back to the Father's house. From that hour his life is a free and joyous giving of himself for the people who are now the people of his choice, because here are "human life and its immortality; human love and its outpouring; the hurt and the healing of death, and the thought of its resurrection glory." The one task he especially sets himself is the unraveling of the mystery which surrounds the death of Mac. Laird, and this is not accomplished until the close of the book, when the reconciliation between embittered hearts takes place at the deathbed of the young minister who has given his life for them. But there is no sense of tragedy or sacrifice attending his death. He comes to it in the line of his work, and it is just a happy going into the other part of life, where he may more perfectly serve.

The plot is a good one. The development merits less praise. There are signs of hasty composition in the sometimes faulty English and in the conversations which lack that indefinable literary quality which makes a conversation which might not offend the *ear* equally pleasing to the *eye*. But, while the style of the book cannot be taken as representative of the author's best efforts and we look for better literary work from her in the future, the story leaves a distinctly pleasant impression, and we are grateful to Harold Brewster for having lived.

H. C. A.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND CO., BOSTON.

The Chief End of Man. By George S. Merriam. pp. 296. $1.50.

In the Prologue the author states that "In the fivefold division of the book, 'Our spiritual Ancestry,' is a bird's-eye view of the main line of advance which culminates in 'The Ideal of To-Day.' A more leisurely retrospect of certain historical passages is given in 'A Traveler's Note-Book;' thoughts on the present aspects are grouped under 'Glimpses;' and 'Daily Bread' introduces a homely and familiar treatment."

The outline is charming, and we follow the author with delight as he begins to sweep the field of history in order to discern what have been the contributions to ethical and religious thought of such men as Homer, Sophocles, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Lucretius, Epictetus. But

when Christianity comes into view, we wonder what has happened to our telescope. The focus has been lost, and what we are gazing at is shadow, not substance!

Mr. Merriam fails at just the point where all other Unitarian writers have failed, when he tries to retain the beauty and form of Christianity while denying its motive force. He refuses to acknowledge that the "Ideal of To-Day," "fidelity to the best we know, and search always for the best," has been made possible only by the power which the *risen* Christ infused into his disheartened and hopeless followers. In place of the Christ who *for our sakes became* poor, who was *willing* to be despised and rejected and crucified that he might open to us the way of salvation, and who rose from the dead to give us a sure hope of everlasting life, Mr. Merriam puts before us his idea of the Christian theology, which he calls "a system of myths,"—"the initial fact of which was a good man whose love went out to bad men and woke in them a sense of their own wrong along with a new hope and joy." The resurrection of Jesus was wholly imaginary, this author thinks. "The hope of immortality is born from a sense of the value of life," and Jesus' life was so perfect that the disciples felt that it *could not* be lost to them. "And first in one mind, then in another, the conviction flashed into bodily image," until, "the story, as it grew with years, was accepted as the charter and foundation of the little society."

Mr. Merriam thinks the "Christian mythology" is fast being outgrown by the thoughtful and spiritual men of this age; but while he asserts that "we have, to-day, a knowledge of man and the world which enables us to build on broader foundations than Jesus or St. Francis," he not only fails to show what these foundations are, but he makes positive misstatements in order to discredit the "mythology" he has discarded. H. C. A.

T. AND T. CLARK, EDINBURG.

Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons.

The Prophecies of Jesus Christ, Relating to His Death, Resurrection and Second Coming, and Their Fulfilment. By Dr. Paul Schwartz Kopff, Translated by Rev. Neil Buchanan. pp. 328. $1.75.

This is the fourth part of a work, the full title of which will be "The Revelation of God in Jesus Christ, its Content, Range and Limits." The last part of the book is published first, because it deals with questions which are receiving extraordinary attention in present day theology. The standpoint of the Göttingen Professor is, that to the infallibility of the content of Jesus' revelation, positively guaranteed by his sinlessness, there attach certain imperfections of the form in which he conceived and proclaimed that revelation. While the contents of his predictions are referred to the infallible revelation of the Son of God, defects must have adhered to him as a prophet.

He argues his position with the thoroughness of a German theolo-

gian, though it will require the complete work to establish the tenability of his position. Students will be startled by some of the concessions made in order to maintain truths which can not be surrendered. It sounds strange, indeed, to hear a Christian teacher maintain that "Jesus held certain mistaken notions even in points that in some way concerned the form of his revelation," but the author always guards such an admission with the counter-claim that not the kernel of his revelation, only the husk was "not entirely inaccessible to error." And no religious value attaches to that.

Since no one denies the Saviour's humanity, it must be acknowledged that his mind was also a really human mind. The necessary implication seems to be that it must have been subject to the limitations which circumscribe the mental life of man.

Among the things which cannot be shaken are Christ's prediction of his resurrection, and its fulfilment confirmed in the reality and coporeity of his post-resurrection appearances. This taken with the conviction of the sinlessness and divinity of Jesus Christ firmly asserted, shows that such discussions are designed to clarify and fortify faith and not to destroy it. E. J. W.

FLOOD AND VINCENT, MEADVILLE, PA.

Imperial Germany. A Critical study of Fact and Character. By Sidney Whitman, F. R. G. S., Author of "The Realm of the Hapsburgs," "Teuton Studies," "The Story of Austria," etc. pp. 330.

The Social Spirit in America. By C. R. Henderson, Associate Professor of Sociology in the University of Chicago. pp. 350.

Roman Life in Pliny's Time. By Maurice Pellison. Translated from the French by Maud Wilkinson, with an Introduction by Frank Justus Miller, Professor in the University of Chicago. pp. 315.

A Short History of Mediæval Europe. By Oiiver J. Thatcher, Ph.D. pp. 309.

Roman and Mediæval Art. Illustrated. By William H. Goodyear, Lecturer to the Brooklyn Institute.

These constitute the required literature in the Chautauqua course for 1897–'98.

The first book named is the latest revision of this work, first published about eight years ago. Errors have been eliminated and valuable new data added. It comes from a faithful student of German history. It covers only *Imperial* Germany, a period of intense interest, not surpassed indeed in the recent history of any other nation for the same number of years. It will be observed that the title-page characterizes the book as "a critical study of fact and character." And so it is. It has a record of facts and deeds of men and enough of statistics, but its main merit lies in the discussions that cover most of its pages. With some of the views here expressed the reader may not agree, but

he will agree that they are presented most attractively and plausibly. Though not a German himself the author is appreciative of German character, sometimes however not to the degree it merits, as is manifest in what he says of the German in colonization and commerce. In spite of this, even a German will find, as did Bismarck, great pleasure in reading the book.

Among the chapters in "The Social Spirit in America" are discussions of home-making as a social art, better houses for the people, public health, good roads and communication, organizations of wage-earners, political reforms, the social spirit, the State school system, voluntary organization of education, the social spirit in conflict with anti-social institutions. The views presented are discriminating and judicious, and the author exhibits an excellent spirit in treating the most vexed and vexing questions. The healthful tone that pervades the book will do much good among those who read it and who will be called upon to meet these questions.

For a popular and fascinating portrayal of thought and practice during the imperial period at Rome, the book that bears the title "Roman Life in Pliny's Time," is hardly surpassed by any that we have seen. Others tell us as well as this, but not in a way so interesting, of Roman schools, the position of women, of wedding ceremonies and how marriage was regarded, of the ways of transacting business, of the education and methods of the Roman lawyer, of the slaves and their treatment, of the customs of society, of the methods of traveling, of the funeral customs, etc. The letters of Pliny, a typical Roman gentleman, are made to do service here, and they are exceedingly helpful. It has been translated into such excellent English that we doubt whether much has been lost, as is usually the case, in the transition from one language to another. The number of illustrations is quite large, and they are of more than usual excellence.

Our commendation, in the January issue of the QUARTERLY, of "Europe in the Middle Age" by Thatcher and Schwill is deserved quite as well by its abridgment, as we find it here in "A Short History of Mediæval Europe." It is not necessary, therefore, to call attention to any special features.

For a like reason we shall merely call attention to "Roman and Mediæval Art" by Goodyear. We had the pleasure of noticing this in our July issue of this year. The whole series of five books makes up a most excellent course of reading.

LEACH, SHEWELL AND SANBORN, BOSTON.

Introduction to American Literature. Including Illustrative Selections with Notes. By F. V. N. Painter, A. M., D. D., Professor of Modern Languages in Roanoke College. pp. 498.

Those who were pleased (and there were many) with Dr. Painter's "Introduction to English Literature" will give a cordial welcome to this

new work from his pen, which is intended to be a companion volume to the other. The plan is substantially the same in each. Five periods are here given with a few representative writers of each period. The other prominent writers are merely named with the titles of their best productions.

Of the special features there are three that mark the book above the others. The one is the careful and comparatively full treatment given to the representative writers with a judicious and discriminating estimate of their works. In these Dr. Painter impresses us as a fair and skillful critic. Another is the "general survey" that serves as an introduction to each period. In these surveys the author seems to grasp with remarkable insight just those features which mark the respective periods and he reveals the special conditions under which the various authors wrote. With these may also be mentioned the excellent general introduction which no reader should omit. The third conspicuous feature is "The Illustrative Selections with Notes." The selections illustrate the distinguishing characteristics of each author, and the notes are helpful to the student in getting a clearer grasp of these characteristics. They are just such notes as the practical teacher feels are best adapted as a help to young students in getting a fair knowledge of representative American literature. The work will unquestionably prove a good text-book in our academies and colleges.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK.

The Occasional Address. Its Composition and Literature. By Lorenzo Sears, L. H. D., Professor in Brown University. Author of "The History of Oratory from the Age of Pericles to the Present Time. pp. 343.

The object of Professor Sears in this book is, to present suggestions and methods for the preparation of the occasional address that nearly every man of literary standing is called upon to deliver. Special occasions and anniversaries of special events are constantly coming in rapid succession, and it is well to be in position to respond to the calls so frequently made. The events would better not be celebrated, unless the speaker can meet the requirements of the occasion. This book will give many suggestions for these extra-professional addresses, whether they be in the line of eulogy, commencement oration, political speech, after-dinner speeches, commemorative address, or almost any kind that may be named. These hints apply to the subject of the discourse, its plan, introduction, discussion and conclusion. Students in our colleges and universities will find this book of great assistance in the preparation of the speeches required of them during their course. It is prepared by one who appreciates their needs and who seemed to have them in mind while preparing the chapters of this book. We recommend it to them as well as to those of maturer years who are called upon for speech-making.

PERIODICALS.

The *Atlantic Monthly's* October issue celebrates its fortieth anniversary and it does so in the best possible manner. Not by illuminated and conspicuous covers but by a table of contents which is remarkably choice. A number of the best writers of the day have contributed to this number. Among them are James Lane Allen, F. Hopkinson Smith, Thomas Bailey Aldrich, Henry M. Stanley, Edmund Clarence Stedman, George Kennan, Sarah Orne Jewett and Kate Douglas Wiggin. And they have written on subjects which are full of interest as Two Principles in Recent American Fiction, Twenty-five Years' Progress in Equatorial Africa, Recent Discoveries Respecting the Origin of the Universe, A Russian Experiment in Self Government and similar valuable subjects. The *Atlantic* is, without doubt, the best magazine now published. It entirely disregards any demand for sensational literature and it caters only to the most cultured taste.

Among the magazines just fresh from the press, is the October "*Table Talk*," which is most valuable to house-keepers, for its pages are rife with useful and interesting matter for them, as for instance, under the first head comes "The Fine Art of Serving Eggs;" Dishes, Dainty and Nourishing," by Mrs. M. A. W. Rodger; "Housekeepers Inquiries" and "New Menus and Seasonable Recipes," by Cornelia C. Bedford; "The New Bill of Fare,' by Mrs. M. C. Myer, which is full of the latest ideas and newest interests to women, and under the second, "A Driving Tour," or an October outing, by Mrs. Burton Kingsland; "An Approved China Drink," by Martha Bockèe Flint, and "Diamond-Back Terrapin," by Calvin D. Wilson. Any of our readers unacquainted with the magazine will receive a sample copy free, if they send name and address to Table Talk Publishing Co., Philadelphia. Pa.

TERMS—$3 00 per annum, in advance.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

EDITED BY

PHILIP M. BIKLÉ,

WITH THE SPECIAL CO-OPERATION OF

M. VALENTINE, D. D., LL. D.,
E. J. WOLF, D. D.,
S. A. ORT, D. D., LL. D.,
W. H. WYNN, PH. D., D. D.

VOL. XXVII.—NO. 4.

OCT. 1897.

GETTYSBURG:
J. E. WIBLE, PRINTER, CARLISLE STREET (SECOND SQUARE).
1897.

CONTENTS OF NO. IV.

ARTICLE. PAGE.

I. IMMORTALITY IN THE LIGHT OF SCRIPTURE AND NATURE, 441
By W. F. EYSTER, D. D.

II. THE LORD'S SUPPER, ... 457
By REV. FRANK P. MANHART, A. M.

III. LUTHER'S ATTITUDE AT THE MARBURG COLLOQUY, . 488
By JOHN J. YOUNG, D. D.

IV. THE FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINES, ... 501
By REV. L. S. KEYSER, A. M.

V. THE PLANET MARS, ... 520
By S. F. BRECKENRIDGE, SC. D., Professor in Wittenberg Seminary.

VI. MOSES AS A SCHOLAR, ... 531
By REV. H. H. HALL, D. D.

VII. SKETCH OF GIDEON SCHERER, ... , 544
By JAMES A. BROWN, D. D.

VIII. THE UNCONSCIOUS SPIRIT OF HERESY, ... 548
By REV. JULIUS F. SEEBACH, A. M.

IX. ORIENTAL ARCHÆOLOGY AND THE OLD TESTAMENT, 559
By REV. JUNIUS B. FOX, PH. D.

X. REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE, ... 575

Later Gleanings—A History of the Hebrew People—A Concordance to the Greek Testament—The Bible and Islam—The Psalter and Canticles—Crucifixion—The Librarian of the Sunday School—The Greater Gospel—Philip Jacob Spener: Augustus Harmann Francke—The Country Charge—The Chief End of Man—The Prophecies of Jesus Christ, Relating to His Death, Resurrection and Second Coming, and Their Fulfillment—Imperial Germany—The Social Spirit in America—Roman Life in Pliny's Time—A Short History of Mediæval Europe—Roman and Mediæval Art—Introduction to American Literature—The Occasional Address.

KEE MAR COLLEGE

AND

Music and Art Conservatory,

[CHARTERED 1850,]

Offers Classic, Normal, Music and Art courses for Diploma and Degrees; comprises three large brick buildings situated on a beautiful eminence, a lovely campus, library, apparatus, hot and cold mountain water, steam heat, gas light, electric bells, a suite of rooms nicely furnished for every two or three students, music lessons on Pipe-Organ, Reed Organ, Piano, Violin, Guitar, Mandolin, Banjo, and Cornet.

Lessons in Drawing, Crayoning, Pastel, Oil and China Painting.

German and French languages taught and spoken.

Special attention paid to Elocution and Voice Culture.

Normal course with Diploma for teaching.

Strict attention given to Physical, Social and Religious Culture.

Kee Mar College is located in a most attractive, refined and healthful city of 14,000 people.

Send for catalogue and journal to

REV. C. L. KEEDY, A. M., M. D., President,

HAGERSTOWN, MD.

Anyone sending a sketch and description may quickly ascertain, free, whether an invention is probably patentable. Communications strictly confidential. Oldest agency for securing patents in America. We have a Washington office. Patents taken through Munn & Co. receive special notice in the

SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN,

beautifully illustrated, largest circulation of any scientific journal, weekly, terms $3.00 a year; $1.50 six months. Specimen copies and HAND BOOK ON PATENTS sent free. Address

MUNN & CO.,
361 Broadway, New York.

IRVING COLLEGE FOR YOUNG LADIES.

The *only* Lutheran school for girls that can *legally, by charter*, confer degrees. The only school for girls in the General Synod that is controlled by a Lutheran Board of Trustees. No school, male or female, can compare with "Irving" in cosy, attractive rooms—all are furnished in oak, nicely carpeted, handsomely papered. Chartered in 1856. Brick building, slate roof. All modern conveniences. Steam heat. Hot and cold water. Electric bells. Synchronized time. Normal, business, special, college courses. Pupils graduating in music enter advanced class in our best Conservatories. Superior instruction on piano, organ, pipe organ, violin, guitar; also in vocal music, elocution, Delsarte, painting, drawing, water-colors, china decoration, etc. Special social drill. Etiquette taught. Fine mineral cabinet. Well-selected library. Able Faculty. *Excellent board is guaranteed.* No pupil can be happy and do good work on poor board. But 20 minutes ride from Harrisburg on C. V. R. R. Send for catalogue and particulars to

E. E. CAMPBELL, A. M., PRES., Mechanicsburg, Pa.

Theology of Luther

IN ITS

Historical Development and Inner Harmony.

BY DR. JULIUS KÖSTLIN.

TRANSLATED BY

REV. CHARLES E. HAY, A. M.

COMPLETE IN TWO VOLUMES.

12mo. Cloth, 1110 pages, $4.50.

At the meeting of the General Synod held at Mansfield, Ohio, the following was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved*, That we call the special attention of the ministers and people of our Church to the issue of a translation of Köstlin's Theology of Luther by the Lutheran Publication House; that we commend the issue of this work as of immense importance to our Church; that we express as the sense of this body that this work should be in the hands of all our ministers, theological students, and many of our laymen, both for the value of the work and as an encouragement to the future issue of works of this character."

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

No. 42 North Ninth Street,

PHILADELPHIA, PA.